Charles Maurras

MY POLITICAL IDEAS

INDICE

FOREWORD.5

NATURAL POLITICS.5

1. Protective inequality.5

2. Freedom plus Necessity.7

3. Heredity and Will.11

4. On Pure Political Will.18

5. The labor question and social democracy.20

6. Where are the French headed?.29

Conclusion: nature and man.37

Part One.40

Man.40

Whether man is man's enemy or his friend.40

Nature and fortune.45

Nature and reason.46

Part Two.49

Principles.49

Force.50

Order.51

Authority.52

The nature of authority .52

The conditions of true authority: Educating leaders .54

Exercise of authority: Power .55

Freedom and Liberty.56

Right and Law.57

Clarifying the nature of law .59

Property.60

Inheritance.60

Duties of inheritance.61

Tradition.62

Part Three.63

Civilization.63

What is civilization?.63

Man is an heir .63

Progress.68

What is progress? .69

Part Four.72

Political science.72

Politics first.72

From biology to politics.72

Laws.74

Organizing empiricism.76

History.77

The human constant taught by history.77

Society.78

Society's living conditions .78

The myth of equality .78

Association - a fact of nature .79

The State.81

3

The reason of State .82

Distinctions between morality and politics.82

Government.83

Organizing .83

The vice of discussion .84

Generosity of Power .85

Action .85

Knowledge and use of interest .85

Money .86

Sovereignty .86

Opinion .87

War and peace.87

Part Five.90

Democracy.90

Birth of democracy: liberalism.90

Consequences of liberalism.90

1° The revolutionary spirit .90

2° Anarchy .91

The reign of democracy.92

Democracy is not organized.93

The power of money .94

Elections: a means of democratic government.95

Universal suffrage .95

Universal suffrage is conservative .96

The democratic state: the French Republic.97

The evil machine .97

The government of things .98

The republic is an oligarchy .98

Parliamentarianism.99

Mandatory instability .99

Lack of national spirit .99

Pure parliamentarianism, or the reign of money .100

The democratic and parliamentary republic "is" centralization .101

Direct consequences of centralization .101

The limits of justice in the Republic .103

The parties.104

The Nature of Parties .104

The Old Republican Party .106

The Liberal Party .107

The Radical Party .108

The Socialist Party .110

The Communist Party .110

Conclusion from radicalism to communism, small or large differences .111

Part Six.114

Social issues.114

The Economy.114

The economic order is the order of nature .114

The relationship between economics and politics .114

The economic question and social laws .115

Classes.116

Class and the individual .117

The historical truth about class .117

Social conflict.118

The peasant.119

How property is destroyed .120

The worker.120

Work organization: guilds and syndicalism.123

The corporation .123

Syndicalism .124

Part Seven.126

Back to living things.126

France and the French.126

The fatherland.126

The fatherland: a fact of nature .126

Patriotic egoism .128

The nation.128

Man and his nationality.129

Nationalism.130

Patriotism and nationalism: definitions .131

The government of France.131

Aristocracy .131

Geographical conditions .133

The Empire, born of the Revolution .134

Dictatorship: dictator and king .135

Integral nationalism: monarchy.136

Integral nationalism .136

Monarchy .137

The lesser evil, the possibility of good .137

Heredity and authority .139

The King.140

Digitized by Pierre Van Ommeslaeghe from the Albatros 1983 edition.

FOREWORD

NATURAL POLITICS

1. Protective inequality.

The little chick breaks its shell and starts to run.

He needs little to cry out: "I am free ... "But what about the little man?

The little man lacks everything. Long before he can run, he needs to be taken from his mother, washed, covered, fed. Before being taught his first steps, his first words, he needs to be guarded from mortal risks. The little he has of instinct is powerless to provide him with the necessary care. he must receive them, all ordered, from others.

He is born. His will is not born, nor is his action itself. He hasn't said I or Me, and he's a long way from doing so.
a circle of rapid, thoughtful action has taken shape around him. The little
inert little man, who would perish if confronted by brute nature, is welcomed into the enclosure of another
nature: he lives only because he is its little citizen.

His existence began with this influx of free external services. His account opens with
he has the benefit of without having been able to deserve them, or even help them with a prayer. He could neither ask for nor desire them; his needs had not yet been revealed to him. Years will pass before memory and acquired reason could offer him any compensatory debit.
However, in the first minute of the first day, when all personal life is very foreign to his body
to his body, which resembles that of a small beast, he attracts and concentrates the fatigues of a group on whom he depends as much as on his mother when he was enclosed in her womb.

The first characteristic of this social activity is therefore that it involves no degree of reciprocity. It's a one-way street, stemming from a single term. As for the term that the child figures, it is mute, infans, and devoid of both freedom and power; the group in which it participates is perfectly pure of all equality: no pact possible, nothing resembling a contract. These moral agreements require two people. The morality of one does not yet exist.

This spectacle of pure authority cannot be acknowledged too formally, nor can it be admired enough, this absolutely clear-cut landscape of hierarchy.

In this way, and not in any other way, the rudiments of human society are configured at first glance.

The nature of this beginning is so luminously defined that it immediately leads to the serious, irresistible irresistible consequence, that no one has been so wrong as the philosophy of the "immortal principles", when it describes the beginnings of human society as the fruit of the fruit of conventions between fully-formed, conscious and free-living fellows, acting on the basis of a kind of equality, quasi-peers if not peers, and quasi-contractors, concluding this or that surrender of a part of their "rights" with the express purpose of guaranteeing the respect of the others.

6

The facts smash these daydreams to smithereens. Liberty is imaginary, equality postiche. Things don't happen that way; they don't even begin to resemble it. in any other way, the regular type of everything that will develop thereafter is essentially the opposite. Everything plays and will play, acts and will act, decides and will decide, proceeds and will proceed by actions of authority and inequality, contradicting, at right angles, the fallible liberal and democratic hypothesis.

Let's suppose that this is not the case, and that the egalitarian hypothesis has the slightest appearance. Let's imagine, impossibly, the little man of an hour or a day, welcomed, as Doctrine would have it Doctrine, by the choir of his peers, made up of children of an hour or a day old. What will they do around him? If Ton wants him to survive, this powerless pygmy absolutely must be be surrounded by giants, whose strength will be used for him, without his control, according to their taste, according to their heart, arbitrarily, for the sole purpose of preventing him from perishing:
Inequality without measure and Necessity without reserve, these are the two tutelary laws whose genius and power he must endure the genius, the power, for its salvation.

It is only by means of this Order (differentiated like all orders) that little man will be able to realize the ideal of Progress: the growth of his body and mind.

He will grow by virtue of these necessary inequalities.

The way in which the little man arrives, the beings who await him and the welcome they give him, situate the advent of social life far below the emergence of the slightest act of will. The roots of the phenomenon touch the depths of mysterious physics.

However - and this new point is perhaps more important than the first - there's nothing far-fetched hierarchical physics. Quite the opposite! Benign and gentle, charitable and generous, it attests to no spirit of antagonism between those it brings into contact: if there was not the shadow of a peace treaty, it's first and foremost because there was no trace of war, no struggle for

life,
between the arriving and the receiving: it's a mutual aid for life that Nature offers to the little guest naked, starving, grieving, with not even an obolus in his mouth to pay for his welcome. Nature only cares to help him. She caresses and cradles him, and strives to make him smile.
to make him smile.

In a world where dolorous multitudes raise long cries of minimal demands, let
those who hear them do not fail to qualify as calamitous maxima, - in this world where everything is supposed to arise from the contradiction of blind interests and the battle of irreducible irreducible egoisms, - here's something quite different, and we can't regard it as the chance of an encounter
the constancy, the rule and the general law of first enjoyment.
this rain of blessings on the newborn. In defiance of any legal balance,
we make him eat without having worked! We force it, yes, we force it to accept without it having given!
given! If mothers respond that they have to support what they have given birth to, their feelings are not to be classified
is not to be classified among the hard axioms of the Just, it proceeds from the supple decree of a Grace. Or, if Ton insists on speaking of justice, it certainly merges with Love.
And so it is! No human life conducts its current primordial operation without seeing it
the finery of tenderness. Contrary to the great complaints of the Romantic poet,
the social letter that appears on the bare shoulder is not written with iron. We see only the marks of kisses
its Fatality is revealed, and we must recognize in it the face of a Favour.

... But the little man grows up: he continues down the same royal road of undue benefit,
literally undue; he never stops receiving. In addition to having been inculcated with a language, sometimes a rich one

and learned, with the grave spiritual heritage it brings, a new harvest that he did not sow
day by day: instruction, initiation and learning.

The pure receptiveness of the nascent state diminishes as the disproportion of forces
between him and those around him diminishes; effort, now possible, is demanded of him; the word he is addressed
more serious, may be tinged with severity. The initial sweetness that had nurtured him,
is succeeded by a masculine love that encourages, prescribes and rewards hard work. Constraint is sometimes
sometimes used against him, for the little man, more docile in one sense, is less so in another.
He sees himself capable of defending himself, even to resist his true good. He has to toil, and toil
pain may cost him. But what he puts in is amply covered and compensated by the sum and value of new

gains.
by the sum and value of new gains, - the approximate account of which can only be sketched
only half.

Indeed, we must leave aside what the little man acquires that is most precious:
the education of character and the shaping of the heart. This vast and complex chapter is infested with
fools
of fools, rascals and shameless people, who keep a certain amount of room to bicker in support of the
child-king's
thesis of the child-king and child-god, whose sublime originality is violated by parents,
diverted by teachers, impoverished or ugly by education, when it's obvious that this necessary
necessary training limits egoism, softens animal harshness and cruelty, curbs mad passions
and cruelty, curbs wild passions, and turns the "little savage" into the most amiable, fresh and charming
boy or girl, when raised, is civilized. The
truth laughs at the most devious sophisms. But, because our presentation of facts is intended to
demonstrate
rather than describe, it's better to neglect a large part of it and cut out the length of an onerous debate.
onerous debate. Let's stick to the indisputable, the unanswerable.
that the predecessor gives to the successor. Here, the child
is not suspected of being able to buy by a line or offset by a point the immense assets
which he communicates, as they have been capitalized by his ancestry, and weighed down by
centuries than he has years. His nourishing circle, having thus become energy and light
light is immensely enlarged, and nothing appears in it that could yet resemble any
of contractual equality. If you like, an exchange takes place. But it's the exchange of ignorance
inexperience of the senses, the clumsiness of the limbs, the uncultivation of the organs, against the
teaching of the arts.
organs, against the teaching of Arts and Crafts: a true and pure gift to the child of the proletarian
to the proletarian's child as to the landowner's child, a gift shared by "the scholarship holder" and the
heir, because the poorest
In a sense, it is infinite, with no return.

... Thus nourished, increased, enriched and adorned, the little man is right to realize
of what he's worth and, if he "sees the end of his nose", to estimate at their price the brilliant novelties
which he aspires to initiate in his day. But, until the proof is in the pudding, until the work has been
he can only access the happy content of the horns of plenty tilted
before him. As he took the trouble to be born, at the very most he must take the trouble to pluck
the golden fruit of the palm that the unknown god sometimes drops at his feet.
feet.

2. Freedom "plus" Necessity.

Once growth is complete, it's time for the second birth. From the little man comes the adult.
Consciousness,
intelligence and will have appeared, he possesses himself. It's his turn to live.
is able to give back to other selves all or part, or more or less, of what has been
without any bidding.

His personal effort resembles that of his fathers, striving for the same ends of melancholy
melancholy and universal discontent that drives every mortal to try to change the face of the world.
of the world. It's never without vertigo and exhilaration. The dizziness of hot youth can't do much to open
can do little to open his eyes to the truth of his life. Let's start by
pretend to do much the same, and follow our young adult into the whirlpool of activity
activity that desire, example and their pulls knot, untie, stimulate and cross.

The eternal worker sets to work, making and unmaking, tearing and adding, destroying and rebuilding.
rebuilds, unless, as a traveler and mediator, he trades, buys and sells. So he can
can enter into all the twists and turns of command and obedience that allow him to test and
himself: consistent or not with himself, faithful or not to others, he can't help
brothers, whether superior or inferior, surpassing them or being surpassed by them
of them, depending on his value or luck, but meeting very few equals, even though it is customary for him,
convenient and courteous to do and say as if they all were.

What he can recognize as true equality between the men who reveal themselves to him
would rather resemble something that would be the same in all of them. How do we represent this identity?

It's a compound of science and conscience: something that is the same, that leads both to see
to see, feel and retain, in every object, that which is also the same, invariable, unvarying, fixed; a faculty of spontaneous
to spontaneously adhere to the universal axioms of numbers and figures; to take refuge
take refuge and rest in the immemorial perceptions or acquisitions of common sense and moral
moral sense; the distinction between right and wrong; the ability to choose or reject both.
In short, everything that, in its various forms and intensities, constitutes, in its essence, the Personal.

To make the idea clearer, let's suppose the architect of the City of Soul, or its surveyor and surveyor-draughtsman
surveyor, busy delineating, with pen or pencil, the vast, vague spaces
occupied and disputed by feelings, passions, images, memories, all elements
energy as well as value, which are natural to every human being: the irregular curve
may tend to form a circle or an oval or any other figure, but it's floating,
mobile, extensible, and endowed with the elasticity of life. Now, the same practitioner is obliged
practitioner to use his compass, and a constant opening, for the radius that will describe a
a small concentric circle with a rigid circumference: the circle will determine the place where the treasure

accumulates the treasure, the deposit of spiritual and moral goods which Reason and Religion
make the attribute of humanity. Every man, having this, is worth every other man,
for that. This is the seat of the impenetrable and inviolable, the unalterable, the incoercible, the sacred. The
nine-tenths of Love, which is physical, receives here its mysterious last tenth,
a half-divine spark that either eternalizes or kills it. This is the reserved place of the highest point of our natures. And, as it is repeated as it is in each of the most dissimilar men, it is their
measure, finally found. How many times can this mental and moral metre be transferred to the stature and volume
stature and volume of the countless examples of the human being? The intensity of
their passions! The extent of their needs! Their talents! Their vigor! Their vices! Those
of their virtues that are of bodily or mixed origin! All that the Person
associates and aggregates mineral, vegetable and animal, in the living foundation of his humanity!

This landmark emerges from human universal expansion. We mustn't think that modern
have discovered it. Sophocles and Terence knew it well. The audience of their plays
did not ignore it. Whatever abuse Ton makes of some of their texts, our Ancients were in no doubt
doubt that personality was equally present in the slave and the master. The

little Platonic servant carried within him, like Socrates, the whole of geometry. Which is not to say
to say that he was Socrates' equal, neither considered nor to be considered as such.
that we're all equal because we all have noses. But let this general
identity exists, that it serves and can serve as a unit of relationship, it's enough: all human rational and moral activity
all human rational and moral activity is subject to the same legislation. It is something else
elsewhere. It is the same there. Whether personal action relates to private life, or to social and political life
and political life, all that is voluntary, committed to rights and duties,
falls under the criterion of Right and Wrong, Good and Evil.

Such is the small circle, and its jurisdiction. It cannot extend to the whole living forest of unconscious and involuntary actions
unconscious and involuntary actions that cover and populate the whole great diffuse figure
is surrounded. The measure of moral laws cannot suffice to police this immense area.

First of all (and this is not disputed by anyone) is the law of the body: cover up so as not to catch a cold.
to keep from catching a cold, to support oneself so as not to fall, to feed oneself so as not to perish. But there must be
other laws. A chorus of collective benefits has already been imposed on the nascent human animal, with a view to its physical and moral growth.
physical and moral growth. If growing up and maturing emancipates him from the original bonds

will it not be subject to other conditions that will also have their own degree of necessity? He is not promised to solitude. He couldn't bear it. The adult man, whatever troubled agitation
which carries him away, and often by the effect of this disorder, does not cease to undergo a first movement which is to seek his fellow man, in order to find himself.
which is to seek out his fellow man, in order to join him.

Now, let's take it that, first of all, he's not going to propose or impose any definite condition of deliberate agreement.
deliberate agreement. His movement will be personal: it's still only individual.

Before being elective, his affinities were instinctive. They even began by being
often due to a combination of circumstances alone. The child has already
played a lot, with many companions (and the first ones to come along) before articulating the kindly
in the public gardens of our big cities. The habit of being
together, that consuetudo in which ancient morality sees a character of friendship.
friendship. This is tightened by the camaraderie of adolescence. Finally, with the intelligence of life
the motives for doing so become more and more reasonable and good.
as if man were becoming aware of the prodigious advantages of his innate social function.
and decided to increase them by imitating Nature's work,
but not without renewing it through his art. In this way, the creature of Society wants in turn to invent and create
the Association.

In reality, this is less clear-cut. An incompressible surge of initial confidence makes him desire and solicit

solicit help, assistance or both from his fellow man. But then, an instinct,
instinct, no less strong, gives rise to an opposite movement, a jet of mistrust, which leads him to desire and solicit
precautions and guarantees in the use of this help or assistance. Either through
some stroke of genius, or by trial and error, he seeks and finds ways to eliminate from the
the risk of variation, the danger of perversion. He sought and
to associate security with duration. The clauses of a Contract will be added to all the
of the desired association: whether sworn or not, oral or not, written on brick or stone
on brick or stone, animal skin, tree trunk or paper, they all make reference to the faith of the people
people who finally decide to commit their free wills according to their conscious minds.

The first trust in the initial association is not surprising.
same destiny of weakness and effort, need and struggle, defense and labor. Here's to me! A
Help! The shoulder. The helping hand. Nothing is more natural to man: weak, he finds himself

strong, never feels sufficiently followed or served. Would he have so eagerly sought the help

if they had not been dissimilar, if they had all been his peers, and if each one
and if each had resembled him like a number to another number? What he desired in others was
what he didn't find exactly the same in himself. The inequality of values, the diversity of talents
talents are the complements that enabled and encouraged the exercise of increasingly rich
richer and more powerful. This order, born of the difference between beings
common success and progress.

As for the mistrust between associates, it had to do with the way they worked together: with hiring and firing.
the schedule, the seasons, the plexus of favorable and hostile conditions.
and hostile conditions; above all, it had to do with the products that resulted from working together:
these were material objects that had to be shared.
to be shared; they are predestined to the continual claims that all sharing
all divisions. The partner warns against the associate just as spontaneously as he can against the looter and the robber.
against looters and tricksters.

If necessity dictates cooperation, then the risk of antagonism will never be eliminated.
neither will the overabundance of products produced by machinism. In universal abundance
universal abundance, there will always be the best and the worst, and differences in quality will be appreciated, desired and disputed.
appreciated, desired and disputed. What will have the honor and pleasure of satisfying basic hunger
will awaken other desires, numerous and ardent, between which contestation will be reborn.
History teaches us that not all wars, foreign or domestic, are born of scarcity.
scarcity. Civil disputes have other causes too. Don't the richest people fight over
their superfluous possessions? We try to prevent this universal evil by foreseeing it; we regulate and bind ourselves.
ourselves. That the Contract should in turn produce difficulties is life's game of passionate interests.
interests. The seeds of war are eternal, as are the needs and wills of peace.

To live, we must associate. To live well, you have to contract. As if born of a genuine
physical impulse, the Association resembles a humble and pressing council of our bodies
whose miseries call out to one another. The Contract stems from the deliberate speculations of the mind
which wishes to confer the stability and identity of its reasonable person upon the changing moods of that which is not it.
that is not itself. To illustrate the distinction, let's refer to the causes that unite the
natural couple - powerful, deep, moving like love - and compare them to the distinct
distinct reason of the nuptial pact that brings them together and sublimates them for a home that wants to last.

Knotted, sealed by the Contract, Association deserves to be considered the marvel of synthetic chemistry

of human nature. This marvel, quite impossible to find at the origin of social connections
social connections, is born at their flourishing center, of which it is the fruit. Contractual association was

preceded and founded - and can therefore be sustained - by everything that has a part in the "essential

constitution of mankind".
of humanity": it is to be hoped that it will be able to lay a strong foundation
conglomerates, half-natural, half-voluntary, offered by the free inheritance of millennia of history
history - homes, cities, provinces, corporations, nations, religion.

In short, the Contract, the legal instrument of social and political progress, translates man's
the personal initiatives of the man who wants to create new groupings in his turn, to suit
to the taste of his thoughts, to the extent of his needs, to safeguard his interests: art, craft,
play, piety, charity; one need only think of these companies, these brotherhoods, to feel
how the individual can multiply the individual, the human can pass the human, promises and hopes
and hopes fertilize each other. An action that knows how to make the constructions of Nature serve the
will of the Spirit.
Nature to the will of the Spirit lends its works a superhuman firmness.

11

Although much has been said, it should not be assumed that Voluntary Association has made any
particular
progress today.

Rather, its power has weakened, and the cause is clear. It has to do with the decline
and reason.

The Middle Ages lived from the contract of association extended to the whole edifice of life. The faith
of
oath exchanged from man to man presided over the multitude of bilateral services
whose vast and profound effectiveness was felt for many centuries. Master
status of wills, contractual commitment was born with the plough, imposed with the sword and
governed
the scepter of kings. But this noble juridical mutuality, enlivened by religion, was deeply rooted
and rooted in the solid trunk of natural institutions: authority, hierarchy,
property, community, personal ties to the soil, hereditary blood ties. Instead of opposing
Association and Society, we combined the two. Otherwise, the system would have quickly
had it ever been born.

Since then, efforts have been made to make people believe that they are only really dependent on, or
beneficiaries of, personal commitments.
of personal commitments: so he claims to settle everything with an I will or I will not. The
impersonal creations of Nature and History are portrayed as far inferior to his own.
inferior to his own. He is made to reserve the characteristics of propriety, usefulness and goodness
goodness to what he himself has derived from the individual industry of his brain, the more or less
personal choice of his heart.
personal choice of his heart. Yet is it he who, by being born, escaped certain death?

death? He was seized and saved by a state of affairs that awaited him. Was it he who invented the discipline
the discipline of science and craft from which he borrows so heavily? He received these
capital from the human race. If he doesn't complain about these assets, he thinks about them too little,
and distinguishes less and less between what he has and what he has not.
and distinguishes less and less how much he still has to receive and draw from them.

3. Heredity and will.

For this high superhuman source has not dried up. Nor have we exhausted the risk
of the misfortunes to which every human life is subject, whether six months, twenty or a hundred years old!
After cold, hunger, destitution and ignorance, there are many other adversities that threaten it.
or triumph over, depending on courage, intelligence and artistry.

It all depends on the individual. He can derange his conduct according to such and such improvised principles
that flatter his desire. But he can also pay serious attention to the customs and mores
established customs and mores. This custom has its reasons, and these reasons are verified by
by experience.

Because there is a Barbarism, ready to destroy and ransom societies, - because they
enclose an Anarchy always ready to violate them, - because there is a mixture of
barbarism and anarchy, highly capable of ruining and breaking all social work contracts, - because these two threats
because these two threats are always in abeyance, - our ancestors established themselves as soldiers and good soldiers
and good soldiers, citizens and good citizens, to preserve their peace and maintain their homes.
the result must count, because without it, we wouldn't be where we are today. Civil and military law
military law was not born of the arbitrary will of a legislator or the caprice of a dominion.
Qn has been subjected to very distinct necessities in founding the pillars of order. It is advisable not to
undermine them> because of the evils they spare.

Other evils would be spared, and great good procured, if individual pride were less
to conceive of the normal conditions of human endeavor, the laws of its success, the order of its progress.

the approximate code of good fortune whose articles Nature seems to have drafted in a
in a half-light that's a little twilight, but in which man can see clearly as soon as he wants to.
to do so. What has preserved it is what preserves it and who will preserve it. These tutelary procedures
should be an object of his constant study: they would make it possible to do things by science, knowing

what you're doing, what you're doing.
knowing what we're doing, what we too often think of as pure routine. And long schools
would be shortened.

The poet-philosopher Maurice Maeterlinck was of great interest to us when he translated Emerson's
Emerson's famous parable of the carpenter who is careful not to place the beam
above his head the beam he wishes to square: he places it between his feet, so that each of his efforts
is multiplied by the weight of the worlds and the combined force of the chorus of stars. But the
carpenter may be drunk, or insane; he may have got the wrong idea about gravitation, or have no idea at
all if he places it in his mind.
if he puts up what needs to be put down, fatigue and exhaustion will come to him
before he has done his work, or he will have lavished excessive time and labour
time and toil, running enormous risks of poor workmanship. This is what happens to the man who
neglects the beneficial effects of laws that would save his effort. He WANTS to get everything
from the bottom up. Narrow-minded, with a vitiated heart, he denies acquired truths to follow fancies
he didn't even invent.
invented.

However, something good and gentle that we haven't yet named: Family,
having opened the only doors to his life, a counsel fortified by his idea of honor and sense of
sense of dignity inclines every civilized adult to begin again the establishments of this
earthly providence. But that's what many people want to dispute today! Just recently,
our Russians, dumbed down or perverted by German Jews, had felt that we could
infinitely better than Mother Nature has done when it comes to receiving and raising
education of children. The episode of their birth has always humiliated the innovative spirit.
Individualistic liberalism and democratic collectivism are equally shocked, not without logic
logic, that the children of the most conscious and emancipated workers should be thrown
thrown into life in this way, without first being consulted or asked to vote on such a serious venture.
such a serious adventure t ~s could do nothing about it: at least our Russians were determined to
to state and centralize domestic households, which until then, in Russia as elsewhere, had formed small
republics,
as elsewhere, formed small, fairly free republics living on their own, according to the
law of the dead, more or less modified by the whims of the living. To this irrational system, they
administrations, services and offices. Strengthened by the feeling of their
pedologists, inventors of a science superior to Pedagogy (which, according to them, was
was insufficiently Marxist, even anti-Marxist in some cases), they decreed that children taken away
from
parents as soon as possible would be given to crèches, nurseries and public gardens. What was once
was the new rule. The child was then invited to shape his or her own life
by electing their own teachers and monitors. Great progress, but unfortunate! The little Russians
have grown badly. Wandering hordes of crippled, sickly, criminal youth grew up.
We had to kill many of them, and go back to the old way, verifying the principle that
Antiphysics is more expensive and less safe than Physics. Who can use waterfall, tide and wind
wind, dispenses with the need to search the bowels of the earth for artificial fuel.
in the bowels of the earth. In politics, usable forces are at hand. And what a power I
As soon as man starts working with Nature, the effort is lightened and shared. The

movement resumes on its own. The son finds it simple to become a father; the former infanti
the heir undertakes to guard and increase the inheritance so as to bequeath it in turn;
the old pupil will raise. The former apprentice will become master; the former initiate, initiator. All the duties
are reversed and passed on to new beneficiaries, through a blend of automatism and awareness
of automatism and conscience, in which habits, imitations, sympathies

antipathies, and from which we must be careful not to exclude the pleasures of egoism, for they are not in obligatory conflict with the social good.
conflict with the social good...

But Mirabeau is the only revolutionary to have understood any of this. Most have
the opposite dream: they rage to rebuild the world on the tip of a pyramid of disinterested
disinterested wills. That things would rather rest on a spacious, natural foundation
natural foundation, they can't bear to see it.

But what does Nature say? In her ample counsel, in which all the resources of life are summoned
and put into action, nothing takes precedence over the maintenance and protection of the domestic roof,

for it is from here, whether royal palace or simple hut, that everything has sprung: works and arts, nations and
civilizations. It has not been sufficiently pointed out that, in the Decalogue, the only reason given for a commandment is that it is "to protect the house".
in support of a commandment affects the IV~ article: that which founds the family and which the Septuagint
in these striking words: "You shall honor your father and your mother, so that you may live long on this good earth
this good land which the Lord God has given you. "Is a particularly long life
granted, in fact, to mortals who have observed this rule? We don't know, but it's certain that political longevity
political longevity belongs to those nations that have complied. No successful government
has ever been free of it. Apart from that, we've seen it all. The history and geography of peoples, produce regimes whose outward form also varies.
unitary or plural, co-opted, inherited, elected or chosen by lot, the only governments
governments that live long, the only ones that are prosperous, are, always and everywhere,
publicly founded on the strong preponderance of the parental institution. For
Dynasties this is self-evident. But the great republics, all those that have overcome and conquered the ages
Rome, Venice, Carthage. Those who disavow these
principles of Nature soon disavow themselves through the practice of unbridled nepotism
nepotism, as is the case with our

Republic of Comrades, which is first and foremost a Republic of Daddy's sons, sons-in-law and nephews,
brothers-in-law and cousins.

Since families are unequal in strength and wealth, prejudice may accuse their reign of
of establishing unjust inequalities between members of the same generation. Before
this reproach, let's look at the faces of those who make it. Either they are Jews who, for
owe everything to the primacy of their race, or they are supplicants of the republican
republican nobility. Their impudent secret oligarchism, and the low profits made from it, establish
their formula for equality. But these lies also show that
destroy Nature: with unequal blood, Nature procreates children, healthy or infirm
or sick, beautiful or ugly, weak or powerful, and it forbids parents to lose interest in their
their creatures, leaving them to live out their entire destiny on the green carpet of the
or examination. Let the competition be supervised, let the exams be fair, and let cheating and fraud be severely punished.
cheating and fraud be severely punished, justice demands it, and we must shout it out, because nothing is more certain.
is more certain. But it's not at all certain that justice demands competition in everything,
nor that everything in life is a contest. Nor is there any proof that certain weaknesses, proven on the racetrack
on the racetrack cannot be compensated for elsewhere, and that the champion's diploma
the champion's diploma, the diploma of the strong in theme and the beast in contest, are the only titles on which to classify human beings.
human beings should be ranked.

Tournaments and jousts are fine tests: life contains others, which are not games.
convention is absent. Personal value, which cannot be over-emphasized
the right to great places, and cannot be over-emphasized; but, because of the very nature of merit
merit, it is neither very difficult nor even unpleasant for it to catch up with or surpass,

on one ground or another, the holders of other non-personal values. In fact, personal
will always have the last word. The self-made man has received it, with a solid temperament
with a solid temperament, robust pride and an original sense of self. The man who takes after his forebears
also retains a sense of pride. When these varied powers come together in a single subject,
it's good for him and, even better, for the community. When they compete, it's even
even better. When they fight hatefully, so much the worse. But is hatred fatal?

Even the most moderate competition would be disastrous if there were only one goal in the world, and only one goal in life.

if life offered only one goal for desires and ambitions; if, above all, the first place in society
the winner of winners, the prize-winner of prize-winners, the test of
of winners, with the test of tests involving the public and supreme designation of the
Best thus called to reign by virtue of his number One. But this is not the case. On the one hand
healthy societies and well-constituted states don't put their crowns up for auction or contest.
and, for the rest, in the extreme variety of human occupations and talents,
conciliations, equivalences and accommodations abound. Conflicts
conflicts also abound. But do we really believe that the artificial selection of personal merits
is so devoid of painful friction? In leaving his empire "to the most worthy
Alexander was also handing it over to the battles of his lieutenants, who, as is only natural, tore it apart
in the name of a sense of dignity.
in the name of dignity and superiority. Such slogans
extended to the whole of civilian life agitated and saddened him. In the end, this establishes a degree of
emotion
a degree of passionate emulation that conceals an awful envy. Public health gains nothing
general level soon suffers a gradual decline: even in the most gifted races
even in the most gifted races, Democracy ends up as Mediocracy.

All declaimers will insist on the damage caused by excessive differences in level. Indeed
perpetuated, excessive inequalities can tend to capture a sum of goods that would thus be
rendered useless and sterile. However, nothing is rarer or more difficult than the duration of very great
fortunes.
fortunes, and when it does occur, it often involves its own justification: especially
in an active and nervous country like ours, this duration requires exceptional virtues. A
ordinarily, vast assets are more easily reunited than conserved, preserved than transmitted.
Powers of dispossession and constant transfer seem to be attached to vast estates
domains whose appearance is the most stable. Laziness and dissipation are the daughters of abundance
abundance. Poverty, on the other hand, contains an energetic and salubrious sting, which has only to
touch man
man to make it disappear quickly. Do these natural compensations and
oscillations have the ultimate purpose of bringing about a wise balance? The fact remains
their effect of moderation and temperance is not in doubt. Whichever way the wheel of fortune turns
wheel of fortune turns, it turns: jealousies and envies are not eternally offended
of the same objects.

The mistake is to speak of justice, which is virtue or the discipline of wills, in relation to those
arrangements that are superior (or inferior) to any voluntary agreement between men.
When the porter in the Marseillaise song complains of not being taken "out of the braies of a
a merchant or a baron", on whom does his reproach fall? To whom can his grievance be directed? God is

too high, and Nature indifferent.

The same boy would be justified in complaining of not having received his due for his work, or of
having been subjected
law that deprives him of it or prevents him from earning it. Such is the area where this great name
of justice has a meaning.

The iniquities to be pursued, chastised and repressed are man-made, and it is on them that the role of justice is exercised.
the normal role of a political state in a society it wishes to be just. And, although

that it, the State, must observe the duties of justice in the exercise of each of its functions
justice, but because of other obligations it must aim, in the small measure of its powers
of its powers, to moderate and regulate the play of individual and collective forces
entrusted to him.

But it can only manage the public interest if it is able to use, with lucid passion
of social nature, as they are, as they play, and as they serve.
The State must not pretend to the impossible task of revising and changing them.
It's a poor excuse for "social justice": it's just another name for equality. The political state must
avoid attacking the infrastructure of the social state, which it cannot and will not achieve.
will never reach, but against which its imbecilic undertakings can cause generous injury
his subjects and himself.

The imaginary grievances raised, in the name of equality, against a perfectly
irresponsible Nature of things have the regular effect of making us lose sight of the real wrongs of criminal
looters, swindlers and freebooters, who are the profiteers of all revolutions. The
speculators who skim public savings never do their dirty work with greater impunity
than when popular jealousies are artfully turned against "acquired wealth" or
"or mobilized against the "two hundred families". Guilty finance excels
to make agriculture, industry and commerce pay in its stead, in the absence of conditions
innocent of the conditions that stem from their natural state.

As for the imaginary goods expected from Equality, they will make everyone suffer. The
democracy, by promising them, only succeeds in unjustly depriving the social body of the real goods
which would result, not from free play, but from the proper use of natural inequalities for the benefit
and progress.

Whoever, for the sake of equality, abolishes any concentration of wealth, also abolishes the indispensable reserves
essential reserves that any business that is a little out of the ordinary requires and mobilizes:

There's no point in replacing these private treasures with those of the State.
decadence of all states burdened by such a system is an indication of the inadequacy of this means of replacement.
replacement.

He who, for the sake of equality, abolishes the normal transmission of property that has not been devoured
in one generation also abolishes one of the sources of this precious concentration he abolishes
everything that makes up and prolongs moral capital, which is even more precious.
The means of education disappear: the maintenance of morals, their elegance, perfection and refinement.

refinement. A barbaric and sad system in which everything is reduced to the measures of a man's or a woman's life!
or woman! We dream of attaining only unjust personal privileges? Do we think of impoverishing
only certain privileged classes? We rob the entire community. A happy
of superimposed layers of influence poured down a blessing in which the most underprivileged
the general state of the country, establishing a high average of culture and politeness.
and politeness: and now all this is being reduced to the same crudeness.

The foreigner who visited us under the ancien régime admired the delicate, pure and fine French spoken

spoken by the simple craftsmen of Paris. Their language reflected, like a polished surface
a natural order of distinction inherent in well-constructed societies: dispares ordines
sane proprios bene constitntae civitatis, as Catholic wisdom so strongly states...

16

There is no social good that is not harvested from the almost limitless field of human differences.
differences. Let's level the playing field, and everything withers away. Justice is dishonored and its interests betrayed
by imposing its name on the smoke rising from these ruins.

Does the hatred of greatness make us prefer these ruins? Let us at least know that they
will not be avoided. Mediocrity doesn't last because it preserves and renews nothing,
because it lacks generosity, dedication and heart. The ever-threatening international violence
internal erosions caused by complacency over lowly errors, will very quickly put an end to
they destroy it, or rather, it destroys itself. The human future wants
a certain heroism, a certain chivalry that cannot be shared equally by all.
of all. Human exceptions are indispensable to humanity. If they are curtailed, they decline,
then disappear, but taking all life with them. Strong lordships are needed for prosperous bourgeoisies
prosperous bourgeoisies for active trades and flourishing arts.
Powerful, generous heads are more than just the beauty and honor of the world.
and salvation.

We must not allow this truth to be suppressed. We must dare to speak it, and as loudly as possible, and without
useless glances, but by contemplating only its clarity, its benefit.

The poor man will honor himself by doing justice to wealth, first in what it is, then if it
is well spent. The man without forebears does only his duty in the just praise of secular
and the historical and moral service of heredity. This does not detract from his dignity
his dignity and pride, but justifies his contempt for the barking of dogs whose job it is to think like dogs.
to think like dogs: these polemicists of anarchy express an idea worthy of them when they
that human relations are necessarily strained and embittered by the experience of
of inequalities; they are much more so by the proclamation of equalities that do not exist. We
know children who do not suffer for not matching their parents' stature. We
know servants and masters between whom the clear difference of functions establishes the
familiarity, a kind of kinship. If the desirable brotherhood of men wanted
that they should be equal, this virtue could not unite brothers of the flesh, since there are elders and juniors.
cadets. But from superior to inferior, as from inferior to superior, deference, respect,
interest, affection and gratitude are sentiments that easily ascend and descend the degrees
Nature places no real obstacle in the way. She even encourages it
by the diversity of services offered, solicited and rendered. Such is the dialogue between the old man and the young
young man. Such is the conversation between master and disciple. Nothing is more cordial than the relationship
of men and leaders in a good army. Besides, some people's pride is just,
and the unbearable arrogance of others, have they any cause to suffer or to cause others to suffer?
These errors, passions and bitterness will, in spite of everything, be less cruel than the constant effects of the forcible myth.
myth of an impossible egalitarianism, when it sharpens, consolidates and perpetuates
perpetuates those fortuitous antagonisms that life, by living, the wind of things, by blowing,
would alleviate, dissipate, modify or heal.

The evil of the world is as natural as the good, but natural evil is multiplied by the dream, by the system, by the artificial.
by the system, by the artificial incentives of democracy. Basically, however enviable social greatness may be
social greatness, the feeling of personal inferiority remains the most bitter of all, for those
who questions the truth of hearts. Batte, opprobrium of the sacred mountain, suffers incomparably more

to be neither Moréas nor Racine than the worst egalitarian to be neither Rothschild nor
Montmorency. Knowing you're an idiot next to Mistral, Barrés or Anatole France is a lot harder
than living as a petit bourgeois in the same neighborhood as M. de Villars.

Besides, there's no need to suffer the slightest injustice.
tyrant. The obsession with Z 'possible abuse makes us forget that its repression is also possible. Whatever

are the Powers, there are other Powers beside them, there is a Power. This sovereign
is to strike down the Great Ones when they are at fault.

We won't accept this view, we'll even reject it out of hand.
which assumes an essential enmity between the rulers and the ruled.
governed. However, their interests are common. And the strongest of all is the interest in justice
one "renders", the other demands. Justice against the Great Ones is perhaps the most
is perhaps the most frequent, if not the easiest, when the Sovereign, soundly constituted
neither on election nor on Money, but on Heredity. Without such power, impunity is assured, as is
impunity is assured, as is preponderance, to the wrongful purchasers, possessors and successors of wealth.

of fortune. With hereditary power, social abuses are judged and corrected by the proper exercise
exercise of the principle of which they unduly avail themselves.
is the most legitimate, the most sensitive, the most common and the most effective.
French Monarchy.

Family government, so misunderstood, is the most progressive of all. In the middle of the
century, a French revolutionary passing through London was indignant at the spectacle
and still does, in this so-called democracy, the institution of a hereditary peerage
hereditary peerage. A City merchant replied: "You would be right, perhaps, Monsieur
member of the Upper House, as Her Grace a Telle is notoriously narrow-minded.
narrow-mindedness. Another for his crass ignorance. A third or fourth for his drunkenness.
And this is worth some dry losses to our community. But whether the fifth or tenth is a distinguished
subject
distinguished and worthy of his rank (which can also be seen) his native position will put him in a
position to
reimburse us, a hundredfold, what all the others may have cost us. "

Nothing could be further from the truth.

A community organized in this way has, in effect, without revolution, disorder or entitlement,
in order and in law, a staff that is sure to be renewed and refreshed by a brilliant
and prepared for the great jobs they can do in the prime of life.
in the prime of life. Because he was the son of Philip, Alexander had conquered the world
before the demagogue Julius Caesar had even thought of it, even though he was born into the high
patriciate
of his Republic. By the system of old France, the victorious genius of Rocroy was able to reveal himself
revealed himself at the age of twenty. A country of hereditary right is always supplied with "young
ministers", and not once every half-century through unworthy adventures such as our Panama
our Panama in 1892, or our Front populaire in 1937: barring such accidents, our
democracy has earned its sobriquet of Old Man's Reign.

The performance of dynasties is not made for one party or one world. It's the obvious
of all. And the interests of the little people are most involved. In the first place, even supposing that the
elites always begin by selfishly serving themselves, the life-long elite has longer
than the other, they are strong consumers and hoarders: what they lack, as Renan said

Renan said, they lack the habit of certain advantages and pleasures on which the "man of quality" is "blasé".
"the man of quality". This greedy predilection of the immoral parvenus can reduce the meager
of the popular. In addition, democratic mismanagement, defective organization
and inferior personnel must periodically, and at ever shorter intervals, bring back
calamities that fall most heavily on the heads of the less fortunate. The
French have been invaded six times since the dawn of this beautiful regime.
homes destroyed, clocks and machines stolen, women abducted and girls raped.
raped. The greater the crises of revolution and war, the more the "little guys" suffer,
while the "big ones" muddle through. If there's a sovereign interest for the lower class, it's in the interest of the higher.

of the nation, it is the peace of order, the regular transmission of its poor assets
assets, even in proportion to their small volume: this class feels a particular need to
not to find themselves without resources at the solemn, but critical hour par excellence
the great and terrible expenses that the arrival of the little man must cost them.

This is where the magnificent virtue of capital, and of the humblest of men, shines forth. Anything that that can diminish this first effort around the cradle is abhorrent to the Nature of
society. But everything that preserves and increases its reserve seals the agreements between the human and the superhuman.
superhuman. We weep over declining birth rates and depopulation. Have we given enough thought to the importance
of this small domestic capital, duly decentralized, established at a short distance from the cradles?
All new life depends on it!

- But you're talking about capital close to the cradle of the little man? Of all little men, then?

- Of course, of course.

- And all cradles?

- All of them! As long as you don't go and get a square, a tape measure and a plumb bob to sing to me... and sing: "Of all of them equally".

- Why not?

- Have you forgotten that already? Equality would melt everything, and nobody would have anything left.

4. Pure political will

In those sad countries where the natural foundations of politics have been
of politics have been permanently replaced by the absurd inventions of egalitarian statism and
of so-called popular voluntarism, which, although a little less insane than in Russia
the natural increase in the weight of their insanity.

Our forefathers, even the least wise, never imagined anything like this. Our nephews, if they survive, won't want to believe it. This was already Edgar Poe's opinion, a hundred years ago, when he wrote the admirable
Parable of the Prairie Dogs", he said to bewildered posterity: "What?
Americans govern themselves? No way! "They had this idea, the funniest in the world, that all men could govern themselves.
of the world, that all men could be born free and equal. "

But this only lasted "until the day when an individual named Mob (or Popu) established a despotism to which Elagabal's was a paradise. This Popu (a foreigner, by the way) was, it is said, the most odious of all men
most odious of all the men who ever encumbered the earth. He was insolent, rapacious, corrupt. He
He had the nature of a giant, the neck of a camel with the heart of a hyena and the brains of a peacock.
In the end, he died of an excess of his own fury, which exhausted him."

Made contemporaries of such incredible foolishness, governed by such insolence, rapacity, corruption, we are even a little caught up in the giant animal, this Mob or Popu, heartless and brainless, called to credibility.
heartless and brainless, destined to die of his turkey-like wrath... But we are also
compensated for this shame by the marvellous spectacle of his absurdity, elevated to perfection.

19

People who have subscribed, and had subscribed, to a program whose profound
the profound difficulties, nor the unheard-of complications, have the chance to agree on the way to realize it.

- Thousands and thousands of voices will have to say I want. And what they want will be. It
sujfira that these majorities designate executors: it will be executed.

- Even the impossible?

- Especially the impossible.

The moon! All we have to do is ask for the moon. Docile hands will pluck it from the sky. Justice and Justice and Equality down from it, calligraphing their names in red ink
on gold-edged paper.

As soon as they are appointed, the poor executors of these mirific wills feel it raining down the very opposite of the promises they have made.
of the promises they have sworn. Their principals hardly suspect. But, little by little
the obvious becomes clear. What cannot be refuses to be. What must be, what is produced
antecedent, follows the course of its consequence. We wanted peace, but by disarming
disarming: the inevitabilities of war break out on all sides, and we have to start rearming. We
abundance: the currency has to be slashed. Wages have risen, but so have prices.
how will they rise if we have no money to pay them?
to pay them?

Democracy rushes blindfolded to the cemetery.

But it leads there, and it's less cheerful.

How could we have suspected so little! We let it be said and written that it is betrayed by the experience

of her mistakes. She is betrayed by herself. Had she never been put to the test, every clear mind
had to deny her any future, like any reason, from the moment she offered and defined herself. Young and
distracted, an André Chénier might have needed to see at work the hideous villains the executioners
Rivarol saw at once what it would be like: it was foolish to believe that a great people could march
it was idiotic to believe that a great people could walk upside down; idiotic that it should be governed
idiotic that those least directly interested in its good should legally have the most influence
influence through their numbers, their factions, their passions.

Any good brain in 1789 could see the pure torchlight of the Rights of Man
the conflagration they heralded, and deduce from it, near or distant effect, something that
was to resemble Regicide, long wars, Trafalgar, Leipzig, Waterloo, Sedan,
depopulation and decadence, all our general setbacks, but without distinguishing, clearly and
their essential quality as natural products of political democracy.

Similarly, the good brains of 1848 and 1871 didn't need to age for half a century or a century.
a century: from social democracy, they saw emerging, like the fruit of the flower, the common
destruction of Capital and the Labor that generates or reproduces it.

Democracy in the State could only ruin the State. Democracy in the workshop
Factory would ruin the Factory and the Workshop.

This was all the more certain as democracy gave itself a career in an hour of the world's life
which provided it with an easy means of exploiting tragic confusion.

5. The workers' question and social democracy

At roughly the same age as our Revolution, large-scale industry had brought with it an enormous contingent of new goods,
an enormous contingent of new goods, but also an imbalance that was not immediately apparent. immediately.

The captains of industry who presided over the unprecedented expansion of the vast machinery machinery that steam was renewing, were good spirits, bold and practical.
the fact is, they did not sense the moral renewal that must accompany the material change they achieved.
change. They were said to be gutless. They had guts like you and me.
The explanation must lie elsewhere.

The great novelty of the modern factory, this vast Inhuman cog, included a worker with no attachments, a veritable nomad parked in a parking lot.
nomad parked in a desert of men, with a salary that, however high,
varied too much, provided him with no serious economic defense, his fate "no longer dependent on his effort and foresight, but on accidents over which he had no control"; his ability to discuss working conditions, limited by the conditions of his own life, the refusal of work, whether from him or his employer, could reduce him to death without a sentence. No property, no professional no guarantee of a future. No real freedom. From then on, no matter how patriotic he may have originally been
patriotic or social feelings, how could we prevent the worker from becoming an agent agent and plaything of revolutions?

His first defensive reflex was normal: he resorted to man's eternal procedure.
By clinging to his fellow men, promising to support them if they supported him, he applied himself to changing his weakness.
to turn his weakness into strength; he joined forces with them, thereby endeavoring to argue with the Powers he needed, but who needed him, the terms of a freer and less onerous contract. freer and less onerous. What he appallingly calls "class solidarity", in its absolute expression does not reflect reality, as the same classes can have very different interests.
interests. A certain community was necessary to his life: it wasn't the class, but the class class seemed to correspond to this necessity.

We cannot look back without horror and pity at what has been said and done against the most legitimate of associations, since the Le Chapelier decree.
associations, since the Le Chapelier decree of 1791, which denies in its own terms the "common interests" of labor, in the name of political democracy and its contractual individualism!

The consequences were bitter.

They were all the more bitter because 19th-century legislators took longer to

to recognize the basic needs of the working world. Legal prejudice supported and covered unintelligent, profit-driven or unjustifiably authoritarian resistance on the part of some employers. resistance of certain employers.

Basically, the evil was increased and it lasted, because the employer, the legislator and the worker all lived
in the same political error: all three believed they were (or should be) a walking Liberty
and Equality. Their rights were formulated identically. Naturally,
each understood them in his or her own way. If the weakest denounced some enormous inequality, the strongest
the stronger replied that, on the contrary, equality would be satisfied and perfect.

to do exactly what they said they would do. Never have the terms of a question, so vitiated, been further
more remote from any hope of solution. The result could only be barbaric anarchy,
for its causes came equally from above, below and in the middle, the middle constituted by the official Palaces of the democratic legislature.
of the democratic legislature.

From these Palaces flowed the laws that accentuated antagonism and pushed a more than civil war to the extreme.
more than civil war. Their government of parties found a welcome auxiliary in the class struggle.
in the class struggle, its factions, its intrigues, its dealings and its ever-recurring outbursts.
where no major industry existed, but where there were classes as everywhere else, we saw socialism
socialism was made up from top to bottom, in a prefecture office, for the pleasure of a
the pleasure of a candidate. In other respects, social democracy needed no official propellants.
official propellants: it found all its facilities in the laws and in the absence of laws
to invade and agitate unfortunate working-class circles. M. de Roux described how labour legislation
the Second Empire and continued in the same vein under the Republic.
Republic. The way in which the idea of mixed unions of employers and workers was rejected in 1884
the legislator's thoughts and ulterior motives! These necessary
unions were still relegated "to the future" by M. Millerand in 1904, when the right idea of general
of general cooperation...

It is fair to say that, in the same disgraced period, leaders, masters and bosses
often successfully attempted fine works of philanthropy and charity. The series of
of their generous foundations has been crowned, quite recently, by the family wage supplement funds
which do them the same honour as the beautiful works of the allotments
of certain religious groups. Nonetheless, the big bosses hardly touched on anything more
of working-class life, they were vainly urged by La Tour du Pin and his school to consider the essential.
to consider the essentials.

They had everything they needed in their heads to understand nothing. The revolutionary
The revolutionary movement of the 18th century had been unable to establish any viable order in France because of
of its guiding ideas. These ideas have survived. They are purely negative. Whether ingested
ingested in massive or infinitesimal doses, their only virtue is to criticize and revolt, not to compose or organize.
to compose, not to organize. There was an old regime, there is no new regime, there is only a tense state of mind.
there is only a state of mind tending to prevent this regime from coming into being 1 . La Tour du Pin faced a mental and moral
mental and moral obstacle stronger than passion or even interest.

Poor French bourgeoisie! Without being all radical, like its orthodox legislator, nor socialist
socialist, like the unionized worker, this bourgeoisie professes and practices a dilution of revolutionary
revolutionary democratism. If they had their way, employers wouldn't stick to charity work.
charity work.

They would certainly have engaged and pursued, under better conditions, their own union organization.

but, once these defense groups had been established, their situation was clear enough to
to reveal to them that these were only fighting formations for social peace, and needed to be
to be supplemented by a powerful initiative that would break with the narrowness of individualism
overcome its timidity and renew the hierarchies of agreement.

Was it difficult to understand the need for a general association that would bring together all the human factors of production?
human factors of production? Not, of course, to deny such powerful divergences of interest,
translated into fierce quarrels, but to take, from above, a clear view of the situation.

1 Cf. Trois idées politiques, Chateaubrinnt, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve.

no less strong convergences created by the immense common interest, - the object of their work, - the principle of all their lives!
the principle of all their lives!

For, from the humble, even the most humble, to the most powerful, even the most powerful, this community of interests can and must moderate the contradictions between them.
interests can and must moderate contradictions and put oppositions in their rightful, subordinate place.
subordinate. The iron worker believes he has an absolute interest in imposing the highest possible wage.

possible, and the iron boss to keep it as low as possible.
interest, and a much stronger one, in the continued existence and flourishing of their common part, the iron work.
and flourish.

All the more so as the industrial economy has no place in the vast framework of the planet! The planet is not "a" workshop, as Say claimed. The real framework of the economy is the Nation. If a workers' strike has cancelled foreign orders received by French employers these orders are transferred to industries on the other side of the Channel or the Rhine. our bosses are not the only ones to suffer: the work they lose is also lost to our workers. workers. Some are deprived of profits, others of wages. If the strike in our mines forces to import coal, wages and profits lost at home are regained abroad. us. In short, French workers, French bosses, we lose, and win together: every war of employers' and workers' unions meets its necessary limit in the understanding of their fate commim, subject to the common national denominator. Whether the discipline is ignored or masked may be the accidental effect of events, systems and their conflicts, it is no less no less extraordinary is the fact that, neither on the second floor of management nor on the first floor of labor,
raised a natural cry of pity, salvation and peace.
of peace.

How could any or all of the parties concerned fail to say, over and over again:

- If we must fight each other, let's fight only to the point where the struggle becomes mortal, where it becomes vital to suspend hostilities in order to help and reunite. Assuming that our class unions have had or retain their raison d'être, let's supplement them with trade unions. unions. To these vast horizontal classifications of bosses, technicians, employees and workers comparable to the bands of the earth's latitude, let's add vertical classifications to communicate between us, to organize our continuous contacts, to regulate those normal exchanges of normal views demanded by the nature and purpose of our industries. through the thick stratified layers of mutual antipathy and ignorance, for the common mutual ignorance for the common labor of the country's economy. Our divisions lead to the total ruin of the French House. We must unite our converging forces. Without exception from the simplest maneuvers, the supreme great leaders, their collaborators of all ranks their collaborators of all ranks, and, in the truth of national life, let us secure the opportunities and means to debate
debate the whole and the details of our interests! This lateral organization must become, either easily, or with difficulty, but very surely, fraternal. Why not? The Union du Syndicat is narrow and direct, and will remain so. There could also be another broad and lasting union, comparable to those

territorial unions that bring together poor and rich, leaders and led, in the body and heart heart of the same country. That would be the Corporation.

This prospect is well worth an internal armistice. Let's say there's only a truce at first, and a short one at that. So be it! After treating once, we'd treat twice and three times. Then we'd come to

and the unholy war would cease to be endemic, systematic. The
conditions for social peace would be discernible. Between members of the same body, nothing proves that wars alone are natural. Mutual aid is too. Why should those who can

work together to extract coal or blow bottles couldn't they apply themselves
work together to solve their problems?

The great evil of the modern worker is a lack of security? He has nothing to call his own, to ensure his future? Special types of property can be created for him the moral property of his profession, analogous to that of rank.
the moral property of his profession, analogous to that of rank for an officer; the common patrimonial property already existing
(too little) in the Syndicate, and which can be extended to the Corporation, where, through joint bilateral efforts,
serve as a symbol and link for the permanent cooperation of all moral factors in the same industry
to the union and corporate good, family properties will have to be created, in order to add
to add fixity and duration to a consolidated order. In this way, the proletariat will disappear. Thus, the the worker will cease to float in a foreign environment. He will become a citizen, the bourgeois of a City. A
bourgeoisie can and must continue the development of the old peasant bourgeoisies,
and "INCORPORATE" the worker into society, as Auguste Comte wished.
Once again, why not? We've seen it all before. We don't make assumptions about spaces.
Men have often tried to live this way, and not without success, as famous as it is varied. Their History expresses their Nature, which is not unfavorable to this empirical concordat,
the science and power of modern man are placing in his hands instruments of new effectiveness
to create states of well-being and easy living that are more complete, more extensive and better than before.
than ever before. Why not repeat and renew what has been successful? It can't fail, if you
if you put your head and heart into it, once again!

But why? And why and how was this call not made? Or, when it was, how was it
was it not heard and carried beyond the limits of the small province occupied by the
advanced group of La Tour du Pin pioneers? What was it that prevented employers and workers from from picking up these lost voices and giving them a fair hearing?

No one, it seems, could refuse to listen to the departures of this hope.
or why were they reluctant to do so? If there were delicate negotiations to be conducted, who could hesitate
hesitate to open them?

Who could refuse, in principle, to consider them?

Who could?

Democracy.

It alone, but its action is present everywhere.

Democracy occupies the legislative state with its divided and divisive government.

Democracy works, threatens, obsesses and paralyzes its employers.

Democracy excites and agitates its proletariat.

Faced with the reform program we've just read, which aims for peace, democracy has drafted its own, which aims for chaos.
its own, aimed at war. In control of a vast portion of the working world, democracy has
a warlike enterprise, as its most general thought postulates
to subject all things to the establishment of equality; to equalize, to disorganize.

The democratic number aims to build a society of equal units, which cannot exist.
exist. The democratic Number thus aims to destroy the society founded on unequal groups
groups, the only ones capable of living and existing alone.

Democracy is warlike. It makes political parties fight, issuing the paradoxical
stable and peaceful state from the indefinite battle that its Constitution and Law prescribe.
Constitution and Law; it claims to order and organize labor by igniting a regular system of
factors of labor a regular system of inextinguishable enmities.

But, sooner or later, social democracy does what political democracy does: it ends up admitting that it's not enough to be a social democracy.
that it's not about peace or treaties. It will wage war until war ceases
for lack of combatants, the non-proletarian combatant being eliminated by a dictatorship of the proletariat
which will seize political power, economic might and,
undoubtedly, as in Russia, life itself, with all defrmt goods destined for
rme presumed equal distribution through the commrmization of the means of their production.

This mise en commrm will be worth whatever it's worth, because either the tool will fall out of the worker's hands
or, as in Russia, it will produce variable and unequal goods, depending on its strength,
application, skill and knowledge. Equal "rights" won't last long in the face of extreme

"fact" of the extreme, infinite physical and moral inequality of the cooperative-sharers. We
the very improbable duration of the effects of this improbable egalitarian distribution.
egalitarian distribution. Outside Russia, where the proof is in the pudding, it's just a future placed on the lap of the gods!
gods! In social democracy, the actual, the living, is not there. Its life consists essentially
in its passion, which is neither social nor economic, a passion that is entirely political and moral, or, if you prefer, impolitical.
if one prefers, impolitical and immorali because it violently pushes nation and civilization to their final downfall, through a "final struggle".
through a merciless "final struggle" - its passion for equality.

To sustain this struggle, the politicians of social democracy, dressed as doctors, have gone to great lengths to justify it.
to justify it. Time has greatly degraded their initial arguments. It is no longer
seventy years ago, that the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer.
and the poor ever poorer. The course of events has brought us other misfortunes
not this one. In the enrichment of the world, rme widespread savings, the spread of movable wealth
wealth, taxation at the service of the non-owners and to the detriment of others, the division
the division and spoliation of inheritances, the debasement of rural property, have outlined one or more
different from that predicted by the false "Iron Law". Except for
due to local and temporary accidents, almost all of them political, people live by working
working, and no one is reduced to the forty-eight extremity of dying fighting.

We have seen the same decline and weakness in rm other illustrious means of justifying bloody
preaching. No law of universal history devotes classes to fighting each other
incessantly. We've seen it. Sometimes. Often. At certain times. In certain places,
determined places. The struggle between rich and poor is a final episode in democratic regimes.
But this regime is neither perpetual nor universal, and class conflict is neither extensive nor important enough to explain the present, the past or the future.
important enough to explain the present, the past and the future of the whole human race,
nor even to provide the key to its principal steps. This law is imaginary. It is
false. And it has prevented us from distinguishing the real one. For, quite different and far-reaching was the other antagonism
quite different antagonism, which occurs immanently, not from class to class, but
within a class - always the same class - that rules or dominates, aristocracy or bourgeoisie.
bourgeoisie.

25

Here and there, skinny people and fat people can squabble rm time. Everywhere, the fat people
have waged war on themselves. Everywhere and in all times, all it takes is for big houses to rise up
the universe of oligarchies is an eternal Verona of Montagues and Capulets.
Montagues and Capulets fight it out with constant fury. There is no peace except through

force, and that comes from outside, except in the extremely rare circumstances that have allowed the birth of the imperial patriciates of history. Whether of Gold, Blood or Intelligence
Intelligence, elites have a way of tearing themselves apart until they die. Class struggle
cannot explain the continual internecine battles waged by this class. On the contrary
on the contrary, its own battle, the internal battle of the patriciates, which provokes the plebs to act against itself.
these uprisings are almost always led by patricians who have deserted their class
of their class, and animated against their peers by the ferocious grudges that their war as brothers had already sown or stimulated.
sown or stimulated. The Gracchi were the flower of Rome's patriciate. The last popular dictator
dictator, Julius Caesar, was descended from Iulus, Aeneas and Venus. This had been shown in Clisthenes and
in Pericles. It can be found in all our Rois des Halles, in all our Mirabeau. It continues
continues before our very eyes in all these bad little people of demagogic plutocrats,
radical lawyers, socialists and communists, born of bourgeois men and women whose greed and jealousy have mobilized against their bourgeoisie. Thus
class struggles seem far less spontaneous than they appear:
the initiative comes from elsewhere, and it often displays the character of pure political artifice...

And then, the classes! Classes! A very small thing compared to the great fact of nature and history which would never have been born without a superior agreement between classes: general, total, consistent, resistant - the Nations!

And it's in the name of the poor myth of the class struggle that we dream of dismembering this vertical organization of Nations in favor of a horizontal, international alliance of.
Classes I Let's not say: pot de terre versus pot de fer. Let's say: simple pot of dreams I We haven't succeeded
succeeded in creating any International. The one that existed before the 1914 war broke up!
After the war, we founded two, three, four, in other words: nothing. In the only place where the shadow
shadow of it, in Russia, what was founded was first and foremost by the Jewish nation, within the framework of another organized nation, within the borders of the Soviet Union.
organized nation, within the borders of a pre-existing empire, and this monster has not stopped
evolve towards the restoration of the National, the Military, and, even more significantly, it began
decimated the initiators of its Revolution, imprisoning and massacring as long as it could its Jews
its Jews, the one and only cement of the Internation. Then came Panslavism. Then came
Panrussism. Let's take a look at our own history. No sooner had the government been installed
of Jews, Socialists and Communists, imposed the military spending their newspapers
for fifty years and for which their deputies have never voted a cent.
never voted a cent; when it came to explaining the palinody, their rhetoricians
call themselves a "National Government" - "in the highest sense of the word".

The anti-nationals thus confess that Nations correspond to necessities of nature which
are stronger than all their chatter, since they carry them away and roll them away, they
who refused to accept them.

There is nothing more serious in the other formulas with which social democracy
tries to excuse its pernicious battle. These formulas, which have nothing to do with social issues, are the monotonous
monotonous slogans of revolutionary politicians in favor of the utopia of equality. They
profit is condemned as immoral: from now on, will pure obedience to Duty or pure Love be the worker's angels?
the worker's angels? The hope is that he will work little, not apply himself
will not work hard, will not apply himself, will not save, will not improve, in short, will not get out of his class and will remain riveted, solidly riveted, for ever.
stuck, firmly stuck, to the feeling of the eternity of his evil: the good heartburns, the helpful

will continue to ferment for the politicians who make their living from them.
their livelihood. Lassalle wanted to teach the worker that he was unhappy. His successors
want to make him so.

By the same token, the worker's work should not be remunerated on the basis of the pieces he produces, but subject to the measure of the work he does.
but by the amount of time he puts into it. Is this absurd? It's absurd for
industry, which loses freedom and quality, and for the nation, whose ruin it is.
whose ruin it is. But democratic reason is happy to raise one more difficulty against the worker
the worker who wants to set foot on the upper echelon of the trade or art. It neutralizes
or attenuates his personal qualities, his special skills, everything that could earn him
to authority and fortune. These escapes are morally forbidden. The
is politics. Through the union, the tribune, the newspaper, comrades
may become town or general councillors, deputies, senators, ministers, presidents
but never boss. We teach them it's impossible. We're careful to add that it
would be suspect. When, by chance, what shouldn't happen does happen, when the worker who has passed
master becomes a manager and a capitalist, he is branded a defector; he is charged with a kind of
treason. This does not prevent, as has happened in the North of France, a bizarre grievance being levelled at his children and grandchildren.
his children and grandchildren for not having come out of Jupiter's thigh: - Your grandparents
parents were seen in the mine or near the loom... So they had a way of leaving their position as
to climb the social mast? to win a kettledrum? The law of things is
a little less inhuman than you said?

On the basis of these observations made a hundred times over, our mad youth liked to repeat that socialism is not socialism.
not socialist. No. But it is democratic. For what it is and what it does can only tend to multiply or complicate
multiply or complicate the material obstacles to the social settlement of the workers' question. This

is the function of social democracy. This is its job. It has to keep the social war going :
its war. By definition, it excludes any corporate regime, because it is a regime of peace. Any worker who is tempted by it is a renegade; the boss who inclines to it, a braggart. Why is this so? Because the difference in values, levels and conditions is not contested under corporate rule. The
corporation violates the essential principle, not of logical, honest socialism, but of equality.

For the same reason, the maxim of social cooperation articulated by Auguste Comte.
Auguste Comte, once admired and practiced by the "noble proletarians" of his obedience:
"Protection from the strong to the weak, devotion from the weak to the strong." The old corporatists of the Book
were known to acknowledge this principle. They even seemed to agree with one pope that "there is no man
that there is no man so rich who does not need another; that there is no man so poor who cannot in something
be useful to another 2". In those pastoral times, Socialism took on a human form, which democracy did not distort.
democracy did not distort.

- We have to help each other, that's the law of nature.

- No mutual aid

And, above all, no law of nature!

Social democracy preaches an unnatural egalitarianism, according to which the strong must insult the weak, and the weak hate the weak.
and the weak must hate the strong.

2 Leo XIII.

The same desire to nurture this hatred, to perpetuate this fight, will strike with the same
any free gift inspired by the employer's religion or goodness. It is the worker's
duty to refuse such gifts, as a matter of dignity. It's a matter of dignity.
what is willingly offered! But the potential donor must always be
considered a thief. A double and triple thief: he steals from the company (in its capital gains), he steals from the worker
(in his profit), he steals from democracy (in the end of the struggle). And this thief of choice
doesn't even have the right to repent or make restitution, except to the taxman, the policeman and the rioter!
the rioter! All works that are the result of employer goodwill are labelled "paternalistic";

a scourge that marks a radical hostility to any extension or development of the magistracy of the father of the family.
of the family man in social life. Don't you think this vocabulary
betrays the logical opposition of the doctors of democracy to the first social arrangement
social arrangement that surrounds the little man-king with moving generosity from the minute
second of his advent.

Their entire school must set itself in battle against all that Nature's System can offer
and benevolent. To the Roussian dogma of the original goodness of man's heart
the frenzied conviction of the fundamental wickedness of the World and of Life:
both are to be held upright and bristling against the human race. The essence of their
doctrine will amount to the regular denigration and general calumny of Being. These masters
call the law of things what their hostile, self-interested artifice botches and decrees.
for the strongest to appear necessarily driven to arrogate to himself, everywhere and always, every profit?
Shouldn't the weakest seem to lose, everywhere and always, in the game of life? But if this is true
how does the little newborn man get immediate access, gratis pro Deo, to what he needs from the
in the surrounding capital?

Liberal democrats ramble. They claim, or imply, that all you have to do is let the elements
and the best or least bad solution will emerge.
The laws of the world are not so gentle! They all administer effects that are as often rigorous
rigorous as they are delicious. But their constant order is not man's enemy, and man has the virtue of extracting the good from the bad.
virtue of extracting good from what may at first harm him. This noble industry of our
and spirits is better than diatribes or jeremiads, and above all than the dogma of
dogma of fatal perpetual complaints about incurable misfortunes. Human effort is hard.
Its meritorious pain must be firmly acknowledged, as must its success, in the face of the arrogant satisfaction
satisfaction that swells a blind optimism, narrow-minded, cruel, always defeated. Neither the liberal democrats
nor the social democrats, the latter crying, the latter4 laughing, are able to legitimize their simplistic
their simplistic monism, which makes them forget half of everything. Neither of them
understand the profound duality that seems to be the ordinary and extraordinary rhythm
of the universe.

So, when we let ourselves go with the flow of mother ideas, we are led into generalities
almost outside the Physics of Society. But the facts of the day are sufficiently consistent
to reveal the luminous, essential political cause of the social conflicts we are witnessing.
democracy! democracy!

Anyone who loses sight of this light is doomed to the worst misunderstandings. Every day we hear
Communism is blamed, and blamed it is. Socialism is attacked, and Socialism is,
rightly reprehensible. But what is essentially to be taken back in them is a point they have in common
and the same point induces a third party, the Radical Liberal Party, to its Statehood.
statist, animated by the same spirit of egalitarian distribution and no less an enemy of man than the

the other two systems: in all three cases, the same aspiration to level out denies or makes

all natural and positive forms of appeasement, which are therefore unequal in form and matter
that can be proposed, studied and obtained.

In all three cases, with varying degrees of credulity, the belief that no life can be lived
happily and honorably lived than by equality. Sooner or later, however, it becomes clear
of the triple general error that throws dupes and victims into the fanatical prejudice of a battle
dead-end battle.

This is because the great evil comes not from Communism, nor from Socialism, nor from radical
but from democracy. Remove democracy, and non-egalitarian communism
can take on useful developments, in the light of past experience: communal property
communal property was more common in old France than in the new; similarly, property-owning
property-owning communities; the cenobitism of religious congregations pushed to extremes
various modes of non-appropriate possession, but dominated by detachment from material goods
but dominated by a detachment from material goods, not by a fury for equality in distribution or
enjoyment. For the same reason,
a non-egalitarian Socialism would conform its system of union and corporate property
to the nature of things, not to artificial utopias. Non-egalitarian statism could have the same
the same virtues...

The State! - Yes, the State! But which state? No, the State of democracy, a simple rmiversal plundering,

where everyone rushes in and from which no one gets anything but debris. The State of the public good
can conceive
which the national interest justifies. When Louis XIV founded the
Gobelins, he was under no obligation to generalize the system, nor to extend it if it proved too costly.
He used the power of the State, without being bound by any form of statism.

In any attempt to settle the social question, the prior removal of democracy is essential
like the precautions of asepsis in the treatment of a wound.

With the morbus democraticus will disappear the regular scandal of state patronage and stimulus
and stimulus given by the State to the slightest cases of social antagonism, the most superficial, the most
artificial
artificial antagonisms that its law seeks to extend and inflame at will. Freed from the ideas, feelings and
factions
and factions of democracy, existing goodwill will regain the freedom of movement
spirits will cease to be subjected to systematic tensions; the artificial animosities
born at the instigation of politicians, will be able to fall away, attenuate and compose. Desirable

arrangements can be concluded or worked out. What is not fatal, but possible, LE
GOOD, will be tried and pursued; sometimes, it will be achieved.

This prognosis is not new. We knew what we were saying as long as forty years ago 3 when we
the experience of our elders and our personal reflections into the double maxim that democracy is evil,
democracy is right and democracy is wrong.
democracy is evil, democracy is death. Only this death is becoming tragic, its prodromes
and its prodromes are cruel. Wherever the worker is induced to disorganize and break down what he
the absurdity of the process, more or less known and felt, creates melancholy
melancholy, bitterness or anger. The meaning and spirit of this unnatural regime
in our country, as in Russia and Spain, to give rise to quite new states of fanatical passion
defined by a poignant taste for carnage for carnage's sake, often followed by
often followed by desires for annihilation that do not go badly with suicidal and sterile tendencies.
sterility. Race and beings surrender with the same impetus as irritated hearts.

3 Even before Enquête sur la Monarchie.

The Nature of the social and living Being, which Level defies, is thus hated. It is hated and pursued
pursued even in the marvels by which ephemeral man attempts to survive.
The hordes who chant "let's wipe the slate clean", after emptying cupboards and burning attics
the attics, ransack everything that genius, art and science have sought to decorate the future
statues, paintings and monuments fall to the axe and the hammer.

These frenzies may be surprising, in that they mark an age of exceptional subversions
subversions, but also in that their epidemic has something foreign to our West.
This last point is the most serious: all major modern crises have an oriental character;
biblical in spirit or Jewish in personnel in the 16th century, the German Reformation,
the English Reformation, the French Reformation, then, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the three
between the Terror and the Commune, and finally, in the twentieth century, the convulsions of
of Moscow, Bude, Madrid and Barcelona show this same trait, more or less vivid, but fundamental.
They express either an intellectual Hebraism, or the deeds of flesh-and-blood Hebrews.
This is not in doubt for Luther, Knox, Calvin, Jean-Jacques, Marx or Trotsky.
Marx, Trotsky or their Russian, Hungarian or Iberian followers. A disinterested
disinterested spectator, Mr Henri Béraud, wrote to a Jewish friend: "Can we remember without
shuddering that the first
Russia's first chamberlain is Kerensky; that Germany's chamberlain is Rosa Luxembourg
called Rosa Luxembourg; that Bavaria's chamberlain was Kurt Eisner; that Austria's chamberlain
chambardeur of Austria is Otto Bauer; that the chambardeur of Hungary is
Bêla Kun; Italy's chamberlain is Claudio Trêves and Catalonia's chamberlain is
Catalonia is called Moise Rosenberg" and that they all "have a single master, Marx...". Agitators or

or ideologues, or both, attest to the same violent pressure of the Semitic East on a West
the West, denationalizing it before demoralizing it. This messianism of carnal Jews,
carried to a climax by its egalitarian insanity, prescribing real human sacrifices, has dared to do anything
dared everything to impose an absurd faith, and when the time came for inescapable despair,
the Jewish madman breaks everything.

But we mustn't forget that ahead of the brutal Jewish outburst, a patient policy, no less Jewish
no less Jewish, had acted in depth by erosion. The two works explain each other,
Evolution skilfully prepared the way for Revolution, and this helps us to understand
Joseph de Maistre's defining word: SATAN.

6. Where are the French headed?

Democracies, however, are withering away on many fronts; almost everywhere, the Revolution has
been
vanquished, vanquished with the love of evil and death, by those ardent hungers for life that animate
Russian Marxism itself seems to be wavering, dealing with the same kind of Russian nationalism.
nationalism: the French find it hard to understand how their country can remain
exposed to so many threats

France was the first nation to suffer blindly an evil it called its good,
but also the first to analyze it, to give it back all its sad true names. The
French renaissance of the idea of salvation has radiated throughout the world,
its political and social impact throughout our country?

Let's not minimize its effects. By the end of the 18th century, when the highest lessons in natural
the progress of their influence has not ceased. It went
and deepening. "Everything that thinks insofar as it thinks" on French soil
French soil, has naturally begun to think against the death of Society and the death of the State.

But this thought had to be able to spread. In a country where ideas circulated unchecked
the influx of light would have been irresistible: Catholics and positivists of the Restoration
Restoration, historians of the Second Empire and Third Republic, had completed
a body of unanswerable doctrines. No one ever replied. But hostile interest has
succeeded in creating good screens or firm barriers to halt or slow down its progress.
Auguste Comte, who died in 1857, was already complaining with justice about these "material means "4
.
Truth comes up against the instructions of an elective State: at the mercy of votes, it cannot neglect to
defend itself in the minds and hearts of its citizens.
to defend itself in the minds and hearts of voters.

This has led to a curious and growing divorce, over the past thirty years or so, between the popular groups most subject to the state and the state's political institutions.
most subjugated to the State and that part of the Nation's intelligence which,
which, being freer, has been able to examine received ideas of history, morality and political
political philosophy. This reaction ~ even clear and strong in state education at secondary and higher levels
secondary and higher education: high school and university teachers play a large part in it
because of the natural independence of their functions. But elementary school have remained
completely alien to it, and one might even go so far as to say excluded from it.
of this vast critical movement. Its staff, trained in a kind of
cradle, or secular seminary, called the Ecole Normale d'instituteurs, is trained for a kind of priesthood
a kind of priesthood and apostolate in favor of the ideal heritage of the Revolution. Its textbooks
and study manuals are half a century behind the times. All the corrections determined by
as secular and free-minded as Renan or Fustel or Taine or Bainville are carefully discarded.
carefully avoided. The spontaneous Counter-Revolution that radiated from France into Europe and the world
world stopped at the threshold of the ninety houses charged with maintaining, department by department
department by department, an ignorant, alimentary, official Dogmatics. Through these new Levites
the "mass" of the people retains, in spite of everything, a vague conformity to the Clouds. Despicable
despicable and outdated ideas, criminal institutions continue to be labeled the bread and wine
of continuous progress. The teacher says it, the pupil believes it. No doubt, very often, a generous
generous post-school oblivion does justice to these false goods. Often I Happily Not
always.

After the little school, the little press is similarly at the orders of the same self-interested Dogma.
The function of this press is to exploit, in favor of democracy, a curious set of misunderstandings
of misunderstandings born of puns. Our old people have the mores of independence. They used
to the King out of horror of oppression, be it clerical, seigneurial or bourgeois.
bourgeois. They are no more enchanted today than they were yesterday by political oppression. He reacts
against it wherever he feels it. That's why we do our utmost to prevent them from feeling it. And the
success of the narcotic is not nil. But then again, not always, the virtue of words
is not enough. It even wears thin. Freedom? Yes, but whose freedom? The swindlers of
public savings? Freedom from what? Freedom to swindle? A good retort is that general freedom
is always defended as long as those elected by the vote are members of the government. This
up to a point, but for a reason that needs to be unraveled: our borough deputy
is the agent of a protection that has become necessary against administrative centralization
administrative centralization and the uniformity of those Napoleonic regulations that France can't afford to
an absurd regime requires the absurd electoral remedy that defrauds it.
would burst If the peasant, the merchant, the entrepreneur, the small rentier, didn't have some sort of
commissionaires parisiens qui, nommés en apparence pour faire de. Lois, have for office to run, on behalf

on behalf of their clientele, the ministers' anterooms and the heads of major public services.
services: this is how our so-called citizens breathe under the weight of an oppressive

oppressive bureaucracy. Nevertheless, when, at the same time, the deputy made his law, in

In 1944-1945, these material means became massacres, theft and imprisonment. (Note from 1952).

his electorate understands that he must obey it exactly as he would the law of a King or an Emperor. King or Emperor: it couldn't be more imperious. The word "liberty" written on the wall does nothing. Nor does the word "equality" prevent the local elector from being a superior and formidable figure.
superior and fearsome figure. All this verbiage is powerless to mask the poor quality
quality of the government formed by the incompetents who, in less than seventy years, have produced produced more than a hundred successive ministries, each comprising some twenty men between whom responsibility was endlessly divided and virtually dissolved. But it's precisely these rapid succession combined with irresponsibility to create the habit of false sanctions, heavy with skepticism and indifference. The comedy of change has led us to resign ourselves with an easy fatalism to the worst malfunctions! We feel them. We suffer from them. Do we remember? Do
to their cause? Intelligence can inhabit individuals, but a people needs to make a great effort a great effort from its cerebral Collective, which is always weak, so that, if it has unraveled the origins of such a long and bloody war, or even of such a great loss of money, that this cause remains and turns him against a particular political regime. Politicians are
politicians have no shortage of skill and activity in giving the passer-by the slip.

For a long time, they've been able to make the glory of belonging to a leaderless state ring loud and clear. t But we're also starting to say we have no leader.
But we're also beginning to think: no leader, no direction, what a pity!

A feeling of doubt and dissatisfaction has gradually taken hold. A significant number of French people have become concerned. Many people understand that the pretext of saving public liberties
establishes the despotism of a party and ensures the immunity of its comrades
comrades. This clear-sightedness has become strong on certain points.
Elsewhere, it is still seeking its direct expression or its shattering virtue. Despite the soft optimism optimism preached by the regime's newspapers, a rare power to stultify
power, the growing discontent must come to join the counter-revolutionary intelligence revolutionary intelligence, whose developments have never been halted, and are even booming.

Official opinion denies this, basing itself on a state of indecision and apathy which it condemns never cease. But apathy is shaken by the anxiety of interests; indecision gives way give way to the terror of major crises.

It remains true that the security of the reigning Party is less threatened than it would be if the reaction of the French spirit had found the powerful support to which it was entitled in the circles should have sensed its grave importance and necessity. After such creations as the Cercle Fustel de Coulanges, bringing together the elite of all three levels of education, after the repeated warnings repeated warnings from a large and lucid Medical Corps, France's immense middle class French middle class could have put the country in a more advanced state of guard and defense.

But it didn't.

Why didn't they? There are causes and reasons.

The reasons are the same that determined the cardinal error at the birth of the workers' question. They stem from the old error of liberal democracy, which has become a habit of language and "thought". of language and "thought", to which more than a few uneducated minds, capitalists, bosses capitalist, boss or wealthy person.

The causes lie in the pitiful fear spread and generalized by a fiscal, judicial and administrative apparatus administrative apparatus, whose hassles are arbitrary, easy and frequent. Here, the big guys make themselves small. Assuming that the "economic congregations" enslave the politicians, the

politicians have done them a favor! As for the real small and medium-sized for whom politics is not their profession, they dare only whisper about politics. The French who pity the Spaniards for their police tyranny haven't looked very carefully or very deeply around them. around them. The spider of the state has spun an immense web among us. But this degree of étatisation escapes us. We're numb to it. It is no less monstrous. Politics indirectly puts the bread of French homes on hold, directly on the establishment of children, on their too often administrative careers, on the protectors to be protected, subsidies, favors and exemptions to be obtained, without which without which life is impossible.

Electoral committees, secret societies, civil servants and the Jewish world force the immense middle class to shameful prudence.

Some press and café gossip remains free, or at least it did before the Front Populaire. but whole sections of this proud, shady people are worse than terrorized: intimidated. They hardly suspect it. Direct, formal persecution would arouse salubrious irritation. the threat is obscure and vague; it can't affect freedom of thought,

but it incredibly limits its expression in private, as well as in public. How quickly
quickly repent of having "shown up" t As, at the urging of friends and family, we promise ourselves
and easily promise others not to "show off" again. This Caesarism without Caesar
to devirilize certain sectors of the real country, those closest to the legal one. We cannot
the moral damage done to us by the institutions of An VIII! Their anonymous despotism
anonymous despotism is painless, but by no means harmless.

These habits have led to a singular evolution of the language: once clean and crisp
French has become flabby, oblique, imprecise, full of backtracks, detours and cowardly antiphrases. We
We seem to want to stuff absorbent cotton in our mouths and stuff the tip of our pens with oakum. The

political parties, whose interest it seemed was to be clear-cut, have themselves ended up losing
the pride of the flag, the sound of the program. All their names are fake. The defenders
of authority and tradition call themselves independents or liberals. Reactionaries are
left-wing republicans". There are no more opportunists: they're all radicals, since that beautiful word no
longer means anything.
no longer means anything t The main point is to avoid the clear-cut idea, the one that involves
obligations of logic, or the drudgery of critical thinking. Some major publications, with a vested interest,

publish worthy defenses of family and heritage, but these good schoolboy duties are crowned
topped off with a heartfelt eulogy of "true democracy"... A few more seasons of this
systematic betrayal of vocabulary 5 , we'll have the Tower of Babel, with all its consequences of
misunderstanding
consequences of misunderstanding and dispersion. No doubt the rhetoricians will have all the more
and the buccaneers who pay them will profit all the more.
But when the historian-philosopher is reduced to moaning his Vera rerum amisimus vocabula,
much is compromised, if not lost. Those who smile in good faith
perilously light-hearted: label fraud must not be allowed to continue, or we must expect
product depreciation. How can we hope to put an end to the least of our ills?
if we lose the courage to name it?

And we're not done with misery! We must also mention the painful accident
which, more than anything else, has affected the depths of true France, because it has
the frank diagnosis that could cure her.

5 Was it the too-clear view of these too-imminent seasons that, in 1939, made so many politicians "va-
t-en guerre" and "boute-feux"?
and boute-feux? "(Note 1952).

In spite of the State and its statism, in spite of its School, in spite of its Press, the evil spirit of

revolutionary
revolutionary survival would have failed more quickly, and would probably even have been eliminated, if the ignorance or error of the social authorities had not received solid reinforcement from a side
where, precisely, it was not to be feared! It's true that this was also the side
from which it would not have been absurd to foresee the worst, this world being always, like old Austria, "a step behind the times".
Austria, "late by one army, one year, one idea".

When, in January 1901, Pope Leo XIII issued his Encyclical Graves de communi
Catholics to call themselves "democrats", he expressly warned them never to use the word
use this word only in a sense that he made very clear: he wanted, he said, that "Christian democracy
he wanted "Christian democracy" to have nothing in common with "social democracy", for it differs from the latter as much as from the socialist system.
as much as the Christian faith differs from the socialist system. And, Doctor, even more than Chief, he added that
should be "condemned to misuse this word in a political sense....
Pope, "democracy, according to the very etymology of the term and the use philosophers have made of it,
indicates popular rule, but in the present circumstances it should only be used (sic
USURPANDA EST) only by stripping it of all political meaning and attributing to it no other meaning other than this beneficent Christian action among the people (BENEFICAM IN POPULUM ACTIONEM CHRISTIANAM)". In short: religious demophilia. In the name of
justice", Christian democrats were urged to spare themselves,
among all the aberrations of social democracy, those that expressly tend towards the
civil conditions (AEQUATIS CIvIBUS) and risk leading to the equality of property
(AD BONORUM ETIAM INTER EOS AEQUALITATEM SIT GRESSUS). And the Pope observed that social reform could only succeed with the participation of all classes.
Useful, very useful services were to be expected from the upper class: from "those to whom
their situation (LOCUS), their wealth (CESUS), their "culture of mind, their moral culture give
the city the most influence. " "In the absence of their assistance", he added, "it is hardly possible to undo
(QUOD VERE VALEAT) to improve the lives of the people as we would like?
life of the people? "In short, the Encyclical excluded and condemned (NEFAS SIT) a Christian democracy
inspired by egalitarianism, tending towards class warfare and the jealous decrying of wealth and birth
of fortune and birth: all errors deemed incompatible with the principle of the
and improvement of the State (CONSERVATIONEM PERFECTIONEMQUE CIVITATIS).

This is, in its terms and spirit, the Birth Act of Christian Democracy.

- Bah!" replied an influential group of French Catholics.
the thing.

Qn set out to make him swallow it... The situation lent itself to this. First of all, this was France.
France; popular government already existed there and, ten years earlier, the same pontificate

had advised accommodation with the Republic.

Political democracy" was naturally safe from censure.

Secondly, the principles of social democracy were inscribed at the head of all the regime's acts and monuments.
of the regime and its monuments: it could be tricky to criticize them, or even to consider them
to criticise them, or even to regard them with suspicion; to do so was to expose oneself to mistrust, to adopt an attitude of tacit rebellion, which should
respect for institutions.

Thirdly - and most importantly - if you put your finger in the electoral and parliamentary gears,
the use of the "word" inevitably worked in favor of the "thing", which was intended to be "swallowed" by the people.

and also to the French Catholic masses, who had no taste for it.
the promise of winning huge majorities: the young lawyers, the zealous young priests
zealous young priests who applied themselves to the meritorious task of conferences, visits
propaganda circles and people's secretariats, with a view to exercising "popular Christian action".
so highly recommended, had only to cross the street to encounter all the temptations of
all the temptations of political democracy and all the seductions of social democracy
in its meetings, conferences and debates. All the more so, if they
candidates? Would they? Would they not? There was no lack of desire.
And so, how could we not be seized by the need to talk about the politics of the left and the sociology of the far left?
the sociology of the far left? None of them could resist! But it cannot be said that they
in fact, they rushed in, either to the class quarrel, where they introduced a sharp
and sermonizers, or to the direct demands of social democracy, or to the supreme
of social democracy, or to the supreme deductions of the principle of popular government.
The result, among other things, mainly in the West, was that castles and presbyteries
and presbyteries were soon at loggerheads: the Catholic ship was sailing quite a long way from the Graves of communi
communi!

An episode irritated passions. For a quarter of a century, in an unfortunate gradual transformation
the magazine VAssociation catholique, and lateral organizations founded by traditional men
of tradition, disciples of Le Play and the Comte de Chambord, had been taken over, then occupied,
and finally subjugated by young teams who believed themselves to be highly advanced because they professed
some of the ideas that had abhorred their grandparents' childhood, the same ideas that
the same ideas that the evolution of French intelligence was in the process of rejecting. Thus La Tour du

Pin, Pascal's father; many others, objects of ironic respect, ended up being called fossils or
were treated as fossils or ghosts; their founding core was practically ousted;
their influence passed to others, who believed themselves certain of triumph, and were so in their own
in their own circles... But all of a sudden, to the astonishment of these young "right-wing leftists", there
appeared, there emerged
out of the far right, younger than they were, more alluring and far more biting, a counter-revolutionary

counter-revolutionary, anti-democratic and anti-republican offensive which, in addition to its qualities
of action
the serious advantage of being strongly reasoned. His dialectic, doubling his polemics
her polemics, quickly undermined neo-liberal republicans and democrats.
advanced young people found themselves lagging far behind, their attempts at discussion were weak and
unhappy
and the so-called avant-garde was hustled out of the fight, relegated to the rear, promoted to the old,
ultra-retarded
ultra-retarded left, quickly abandoned by all that was alive in the youth of the right.
The sons and daughters of the rallies de-radicalized, to militate passionately with the new defenders of
authority
of authority, tradition and order, hierarchy and monarchy.

The reasons they put forward were indisputable; we had to put up with them. It wasn't easy.
Less cheerful still, more unbearable than anything else, was the resounding denial given to the prejudice
which had set this whole world in motion, determined all this error: a prejudice without foundation,
that the modern mind should always move to the left, [c.
territories of the future were to belong by foundation or to revert by right to the absurd views
developed by pious rhetors without brains, - some mystical clockwork spring
the function of resonating, in space and on the abyss, in such a way as to tax as archaic
archaism all that, until then, had created strength and life, order and joy in the universe.

But the ephemeral acquisitions of intelligence and experience took over again. Qn
easily demonstrated the extreme frivolity of this too-easy recourse to the antinomy of yesterday and
tomorrow, of the present and the future.
present and future.

35

Events showed that there was nothing fatal or ineluctable in the progress of revolutionary ideas.
revolutionary ideas. They were not invincible. They were defeated. And, worst of all
worst of all, with their glory vanished the bad reason of false force majeure, with which the
against the precautions dictated by Leo XIII! What the Pope had
had not swallowed at all, the nature of things vomited it up. The avenue of history closed to these
their censors, whose age, faith, numbers, success and reason gleefully

gleefully seized a "century" that others had been a little too quick to discount. What a
a disappointment! By dint of moaning and groaning, stinging wounds formed that bled for a long time
and never healed.
never healed. We can still see the precious droplets of this baked rage
from the brains of a few old men. For it was well worth sacrificing the most
personal and domestic loyalties, saddened friends, bullied and grieved masters
masters, in the name of an inexcusable metaphysics of Time, to see themselves thus contradicted,
humiliated, turned away to the bench of veterans and burgraves, by real Time, by the divine Old Man 6
,
who spares nothing but the Truth!

The death of Leo XIII didn't help matters. His successor, a vigorous thinker
and clear-sighted politician, put the finishing touches to the anguish of this band of rogue conservatives:
he theoretically
theoretically condemned their Sillon.

There was nothing definitive about this condemnation: the die had been cast, positions had been taken,
electoral and social organizations had been founded.
the electoral and social organizations were founded, and all sharp vanities were defending themselves,
claws in the air.
in the air. Could we turn back? If not, - humanly speaking - what could be done?

There was not the slightest hope of escaping new criticism or refreshing old clichés.
old clichés: we were beaten beforehand in these debates of historical sense and reason. The
discussion was even open to pontifical reproach. In the end, we took refuge, gravely and haughtily
on the higher peaks of practicality, with great contempt for doctrinal speculation.
doctrinal speculations. It was agreed to adopt the vocabulary, ideas and principles of the
of the "popular masses", to match their "aspirations". Not without
of verbal reverence for orthodoxy, indifference to truth and falsehood was taken so far
far that, with a few formal reservations against demagoguery and "false" democracy
democracy, we managed to continue ignoring the powerful moral and political reasons
or natural political reasons that shone throughout the Encyclical Graves de commun: reciprocity of
services
of services between classes and conditions, the benefits of their inequalities, the privileges of nature
or history. The best works of the Catholic Social School were also revived;
the royalists were left virtually alone to deal with corporate doctrine: in those high times,
the corporation had the serious flaw of antagonizing electoral syndicalism.

How, then, could a world scarred by this recent failure have taken the slightest
the slightest interest in the counter-revolutionary intellectual movement that had been, precisely,
between 1900 and 1910, the source of all its ills! On the contrary, resentment, combined with the very
chimerical hope of revenge, made this world more than indulgent of the worst outrages
outrages of our "Christian reds" over the last ten years; for sometimes it has given the
the scandal of approving outbursts of religious communism or priestly antipatriotism.
antipatriotism; at other times, disapproving of them, it has given rise to the other, perhaps worse, scandal
of not

to be seen.

The result was painful damage on a grand scale.

6 Sainte-Beuve.

The public, made up of a vast moral region of France's best real country, was thus delivered up to the deceptions of official verbiage: it did not receive the enlightenment to which it was entitled to the principles that govern the major interests of social and civil existence.
civil existence.

The flag of cruel charity came to cover the same errors that would, in Spain,
dripping with beautiful, pure blood.

The love of the people seemed to allow these errors to be covered up or even exploited. The treated with a contempt that was thought to be skilful and prudent those short and powerful knots by which, - as a punishment for certain faults
material catastrophe adheres, holds and hangs on political error.
political error. An astonishing vocal virtuosity was placed at the service of this guilty silence of the mind.

And yet, for many years, a dialogue had been famous

- Your democracy poisons," said Le Play to Tocqueville.

- But," Tocqueville more or less replied, "If I despair of administering the antidote?

- I won't administer the poison," replied the firm Le Play. A disastrous rhetoric was to replace philosophy; the ruling class, or the class that should have ruled, practiced or underwent a kind of underwent a kind of compulsory anaesthesia in the face of Falsehood. Nevertheless, clear eyes
clear eyes discerned, from a short distance, the harsh sanctions with which neglected reality would strike

In vain! The Falsehood was left alone, or spared,
served, propelled or even acclaimed, and for long days sailed on, prosperous and happy,

Vessel favored by a great Aquilon :

it nonetheless ran in the direction of certain breakers that today we see without
binoculars.

How could it have been otherwise? And how could we not have thought about it? Beyond words are things. Sooner or later, it's their turn to make themselves felt. So there's no point in having given in to the
to the "greatest derangement of the mind", which is to make them appear as we want them, not as they are.
as they are. Wanting people to believe in peace, instead of consenting to see a war coming, leads to "disarmament", which in turn leads to "disarmament", which in turn leads to "disarmament".
leads to "disarmament", which will make the war even more disastrous. Wanting people to think you have
millions in your pocket, when there's not a penny left, is a combination of fraud and destitution.
Wanting people to believe in the possible beneficence of class struggle and democratic envy,
mother of all our evils, does not diminish its malice, but covers it up and recommends it, protects it and facilitates it.
protects and facilitates it, aggravates and multiplies it.

That these evils have grown in this way is an obvious fact that contracts male hearts.
that could, that should. It's here, above all, that,
the error of honest people foreseen by the great Le Play. And nothing is more
dreadful.

That, faced with such a grave risk, the best people in the country don't rise to the occasion with the decisiveness we'd expect of them.
the depths of the most beautiful souls, the pure pinnacle of civic piety and social
social devotion are not even bathed in sufficient light, and that this light does not come
not come from where they should, this horribly increases all our immediate perils.

For finally, the nation thus left without direction is the same one from which many of its neighbors have

solicited, learned and received the Laws of their Renaissance! As has been so aptly put, "France holds the honour
the honor, other countries keep the profit". Will France be allowed to languish for much longer
in shameful mental inferiority?

Its intellectual renewal may yet be delayed, but further delays would jeopardize more than its peace: its life.
than his peace: his life.

Conclusion: nature and man

That's why we don't yield to the call of vain abstractions when we beg sincere minds
sincere minds to go back to principles and revise their overall views.

it is particularly essential that they take a hard look at this essential point of the relationship between the voluntary and the natural, the moral and the physical, in the social fabric of the human being.
being.

By deceiving themselves and allowing themselves to be deceived, by replacing knowledge with "faith", that nothing authorizes and everything denies, we do more than expose ourselves to bloody ordeals.
bloody ordeals: we rush headlong into them, and in some cases help to precipitate them.
precipitate them.

We must know the truths of nature, or perish under their blows.

Let us not be reproached for the humble degree to which our investigation has been carried out here.

Let it not be said that we dwell on the subject of man.

We don't dwell on it at all.

We have no intention of neglecting human structure, or what structure and matter
structure and matter. But to examine an object thoroughly
an object, we begin by setting it apart from that which is not it. Matter be it! To know
we need to get close to and feel this precious fabric of social life. Such matter
is no more insignificant than that of any other host in the universe. Some romantic preacher
in the pulpit of Notre-Dame, has railed against

Saint Thomas Aquinas, guilty of deriving his Principle of Individuation from Matter.
This sonorous cymbal blast will not prevent anyone from approaching, with false shame and serene simplicity
the study of the first natural elements of the human compound. The better we can
understanding of what it's made of, the better we'll be able to free ourselves from the misconceptions whose applications
costly to apply.

The better nature is seen in its truth, the better we'll be able to place rights and duties where they belong

where they belong, instead of filling a space where they cannot be practiced because they are not and cannot be there.
can't be: all we find there are links of necessity to which we can do nothing but acknowledge
and, to overcome them, begin by obeying them.

The nature of men, that which precedes their will, is a subject whose mere mention is enough to offend Panjurism.
offend contractual panjurism, which is the source of the unbridled voluntarism
of liberal democracy, which assumes that we can do whatever we feel like doing!
to want! Their ambitions are mad, and their madness judges the principle from which they spring.

All the bombast in their honor will never make it in the power of the little man
to elect his father and mother, nor that his freedom, however sovereign, can choose
the location of his cradle. This point settles everything. Neither Kant nor Plato can do anything about it. Their
inventions of the past are worthless here. Whether we like it or not, we have to accept these territories
territories, neither willed, elected nor eligible, recognize their potential beneficence, or resign ourselves
to systemic blindness, which is the death of thought and the suicide of action.

The journey into the half-darkness of Social Physics cannot be made without awakening,
in their half-light, various transparencies that illuminate, as if from below, this and that plane where
our purely material elements meet our personal and moral elements, and may even
even aspire to reach certain divine parts of the order of life. Before the table of the
of the Law that obliges us to nurture and raise children, the exact description of the
his state of extreme distress, which confers on him the status of a natural needy person
with the rank of rich legatee and high social beneficiary, seems to come, as it were,
of the gracious paternal and maternal instinct, whose profound awareness
honors those worthy of the human name and face.

The conclusion could go beyond Physics. It suggests that raw Being cannot but contain a formal essence.

not contain a formal and certain essence of Good. We could therefore determine the possibilities
possibilities of a dormant happiness, mysteriously propitious to such human destinies that a
and rigorous analysis.

Let's avoid pushing the line any further, and stick to its simplest expression:
the humble intellection of the sensible lifts the net of a light, perhaps not expected
to the meditation of higher laws, whose terms it verifies and reinforces. Far from
therefore, far from harming each other, as fools believe, these truths, which approach and converge
converge, derive new value and influence from the diversity of their points of departure.

To distinguish is not to conflict, not even to divide or separate. Morality is the
of voluntary action. The purpose of natural Politics is to deepen an impersonal
impersonal order. No doubt, Ancients and Moderns, including the greatest here, have confused these
with other, quite similar, objects. This is no reason to make the confusion eternal.
As far as I'm concerned, everything leads me to pursue, as deeply as I can, this study of the social
foundations of human life.
of human life, which has been my constant preoccupation.

In the remote places where time has not failed me to look behind me 7 , and to remember the roads
to remember the paths I've travelled, lost or found again, I've gathered the essential ideas
my thoughts and actions. The brief summary that follows seems to me

would seem to me to articulate less clearly what it says if I didn't link it to what a philosophy would call philosophy would call second causes and another philosophy first natural laws. From whatever name we call it, what is, is

That's what's certain.

Causes or Laws, these principles are too clear, and their clarity does too much good, to consent to let them become muddled
to allow them to be confused, obscured or disfigured.

We shouldn't think that the political and social machine is running on empty. When it rains when it rains fire and blood, poor men are under it! Quite the opposite of

These pages were written at the Prison de la Santé in early 1937.

Malebranche, they don't lack feeling to suffer. A just thought can rescue them, sometimes save them. It is to have pity on them to speak the truth.

Part One
The human being

Whether man is man's enemy or man's friend

True philosophers consistently refuse to speak of men other than in society.
in society. There is no such thing as a loner. Robinson himself was pursued and sustained in his lie by the innumerable results of mankind's immemorial labors.

The hermit in his desert, the stylite on his pillar may isolate and entrench himself, but they both benefit from the spiritual riches accumulated by their predecessors, no matter how little they eat or wear. their food or their clothing. They owe it all to human activity.
On their own, they would die without a trace. Thus demands a profound law which, if it is which, though still poorly understood and formulated, is as rigorously imposed on our species as falling imposes itself on heavy bodies that lose their point of support, or boiling imposes itself on water

heated to a hundred degrees.

Man is a political animal (or, in modern parlance, a social animal).
Aristotle observed in the fourth century BC. Man is an animal that
forms societies or, as he put it, cities, and the city he forms is built on friendship.

In fact, Aristotle believed that man, generally speaking and all things being equal
all things being equal, has always derived a natural pleasure from the sight and commerce of his fellow man. All
instincts of sympathy and companionship, the taste of home and the public square, language
language, the age-old refinements of conversation would seem inexplicable unless we
the natural friendship of man for man.

Here," must have said this great observer of the whole of nature, "here are men who eat and drink together.
and drink together. They've sought each other out, invited each other to eat and drink, and it's clear
that the pleasure of companionship increases each person's joy tenfold. This child is having fun, but he's only really playing
if he's allowed playmates. It takes a great passion like
avarice or love to wrest from man the taste for society. His face still bears
traces of the hardships and struggles he has inflicted on himself by fleeing.

The roads have become safe: however, the carters wait for each other to travel together
together, and the pleasure of relieving boredom is so great that one neglects to worry
one neglects the care of his carriage, the other the time of his market. The last activity of old men whose age is over
is to sit in groups in the sun, repeating the same idle words to each other every day.
idle talk. Such are men in all walks of life. But what about women? Their
their example is the most marvellous, for they all hate each other and spend their whole lives
seeking each other out. The desire to live together is stronger than the spirit of rivalry that comes from love.
born of love.

The pessimists of all times have often disputed Aristotle's principle. But everything they
they said and thought was summed up, twenty centuries after Aristotle, by rami and Charles's master

II Stuart, the author of Leviathan, the theorist of Absolute Monarchy, that illustrious Hobbes who
theorists of vital competition and the predominance of the strongest.

Hobbes posited that man is born the enemy of man, and this enmity was summed up by him
by him in the memorable formula: man is to man like a wolf. Universal history,

and contemporary observation provide so many apparent verifications of this principle
that it's almost pointless to show them.

But, someone says, Hobbes is a moderate pessimist! He doesn't even need to suspect that he's
the species of wolves when he dares to compare it to the species of men.
men. Does he not know that wolves, as the saying goes, never eat each other?
And man does just that.

"Man eats man. He only eats man. Anthropophagy appears
to superficial minds as something peculiar to a few peoples, as remote as they are savage.
which is diminishing day by day. What blindness! Anthropophagy neither decreases nor
it's transformed.

"We no longer eat human flesh, we eat human labor. From the supply
that we breathe, is there a single element that we borrow from nature that hasn't been
that has not first been watered with human sweat and tears?

"It's only in the countryside that you can approach a natural stream or spring and drink Peau du ciel.
natural spring and drink Peau du ciel as our earth has distilled it in its dens and
rocks. The most sober of city-dwellers, the one who drinks only water, begins to demand a special water

bottled, sealed, transported and thus bearing witness to the same human effort
as the most precious elixir. In fact, drinking water from cities is piped in at great expense.
and piping.

"Go back to the fields and pick a bunch of grapes or a piece of fruit: not only has the tree or the stump
not only has the tree or stump required long cultivation, but its stem is not in its natural state.
It has been grafted, and a long series of indefinite grafting operations have transformed and often
improved the grafting bud. The
seed itself, through the selections it has undergone, carries within its mystery a capital
of human effort. By biting into the pulp of the fruit, you are once again biting into man's work.
work.

"I don't need to list all the breeds of animals that have been tamed, domesticated,
humanized, to provide food and clothing for humans. Observe, however, that
these unnatural resources must receive a second kind of treatment, a new degree of
a new degree of humanization to earn the honor of being ingested. It's not enough to
it is not enough to shear the wool of the sheep, which is human work.
of the housewife or maid. It's not enough to slaughter meat, or to cut it up; it's a universal
a universal necessity to subject it to fire before devouring it: human work, human work.
human work. This intermediary between nature and our bodies is to be found everywhere.

"No, wolves don't eat themselves this way! And it's because the wolf doesn't eat the wolf's work
wolf's work that he is so rarely led to wage the war on the wolf that is a necessity among men.
men.

"The wolf finds in nature what man is forced to ask of man.
Nature is immense, its resources infinite; the wolf can call it his mother and his maid.

nurse. But manufactured products, humanized products, those that man calls his goods, are relatively few in number.
his goods, are relatively few in number; hence, between men, a rivalry, a fatal
competition. The feast is narrow: any new guest will be looked upon unfavorably, just as he will
will look askance at those already seated.

"This newcomer does not appear to the man who already owns as a simple consumer
consumer whose appetite is formidable; he is also a prey being, a potential conqueror.
conqueror. Producing, making things for oneself, is undoubtedly one way to live, but there's another way.
is to steal the products of production, either by trickery or violence. It's often in man
here's a good example: most people who are neither thieves nor robbers
spend their lives in fear of being robbed or stolen from. Proof positive that personal reflection
experience, tradition and hereditary memory all work together to mark the enduring
the ever-present energy of the instincts to steal and defraud. We have the genius of
conquest in our blood.

"Man cannot see man without immediately imagining him as conqueror or conquered,
as exploiter or exploited, as victor or vanquished, and finally, to put it in a nutshell,
as an enemy. Aristotle may well have said that man is social. He wouldn't be social if he weren't industrious
industry, and the fruits of his industry are so necessary or so beautiful that he cannot show them off
without being forced to take up arms. Defending these goods, or pillaging them,
is the whole story of the world.

There's a great deal of truth in the discourse of the pessimists who bid against Hobbes and his followers in this way.
Hobbes and his followers. I wish we could resign ourselves to admitting as certain everything they say
and not be afraid to teach that man is indeed more than a wolf to man; but on condition
wolf; but on condition that the aphorism be corrected by the addition of this new aphorism, equally
truth, that for man, man is a god.

Yes, industry explains the fierce competition and rivalry developed between men.
But industry also explains their concordances and friendships. When Robinson
first discovered the imprint of a bare foot on the sand, he was horrified, saying to himself
and said to himself, in the words of Hobbes: "Here is he who will eat all my goods, and
who will eat me...". When he discovered the weak Friday, a poor harmless savage, he said to himself.
my collaborator, my client and my protégé. I have nothing to fear from him. He can expect

expect anything from me. I'll use him.

And Friday becomes useful to Robinson, who uses him for a wide variety of jobs. In
little time, the island's new inhabitant renders services infinitely superior to all the material expenses
of his upkeep. The former loner's wealth multiplies through cooperation, and he himself is saved from
the two suggestions of the desert.
himself is saved from the two suggestions of the desert, mystical frenzy or stupefaction. One by
through each other, they rise up and, so to speak, become civilized.

Robinson's case is too particular, too privileged, to ever be used as the starting point
the starting point of a theory of society; the great fault of 18th-century systems was to reason
to reason about such cases. We know that, to understand the social mechanism, we need to observe it in
its primordial element,
we must observe it in its primitive element, which has always been the family. But it's
industry, the necessity of industry, which fixed the family and made it permanent. At
receiving the sons and daughters given to him by his wife', man felt the same instincts at work within
him as those
Robinson's heart: "Here are collaborators, clients and protégés.
clients and protégés. I have nothing to fear from them. They can expect everything from me. And the
benefit will do me good." As his family continued to grow, the father

observed that his power also increased, and his strength, and all his means of transforming
around him, or to defend his products against competitors or conquerors.
competitors or conquerors.

Observe, I pray you, that it is between beings of unequal condition that primitive society always seems
to be formed.
primitive society. Rousseau believed that this inequality was the result of civilization.
Quite the contrary! Society, civilization, is born of inequality. No civilization,
no society would have arisen from equal beings. True equals placed in equal or even
conditions would almost inevitably have killed each other.
The free exchange and trade of equivalent goods is not the origin, but the final consequence
consequences of long-standing social improvements. The inequality of encounters creates the need
of acceptance and concession, which are fruitful; evil is mitigated, good is strengthened, both
both physical and moral. That one man can give life, or security, or health to another man
who would otherwise lose them, these are new social relationships, the first to use
and, if you like, "exploiting", by a capital he has created, saved or reconstituted, the second driven
by interest, of course, by filial love or gratitude, to find this exploitation
pleasant, or useful, or at the very least tolerable.

The protective or paternal instinct had other effects. The head of the family not only had

his own life. Fugitives and supplicants came running to him, who,
in a state of weakness, destitution and helplessness, came to offer their arms or even
in exchange for protection, without which they were doomed to perish.
Through adoptions of this kind, the family would grow. The war, which always had to be waged
at some point against rival families, brought a new order of growth.
It has always been exceptional in the history of the world for the victorious group to slaughter
the vanquished group for food or even revenge. Women of all ages
are almost always reserved, the youngest for the role of wives or concubines, the
older ones for the domestic duties for which they have always been valued. If the
massacre, even of warriors, is rare, enslavement is so widespread that Bossuet
that Bossuet could not consider it without respect. When you think about it, no primitive fact
the immense value every man attaches to the life and function of another man.
of another man.

You were a wolf to me just now, but as soon as I've vanquished the wolf, I kill him, because he can only bring me
only bring me further harm. Now, you, who are a man and whom I' have wounded on the ground
you are like a god holding my hand. What would your death do to me? On the contrary, your life can
a new source of good. Get up, I'll bandage you. Heal yourself, and I will employ you.

"With a few essential precautions taken against your strength and against the memories
of your freedom, I'll treat you well so that you work for me. Close to my home,
participating in my safety, my food and all my other powers, you will live a long life:
your work, hear you, your invaluable work enters my property. But I am obliged
to guarantee you, in addition to existence, sustenance and all the kinds of happiness that will be
compatible with mine.

So the slave's face was friendly to the master. And, little by little, as habit set in,
when oblivion had done its work, when daily good treatment had made one forget
such primitive cruelty, the master's face became the slave's friend. It signified foresight, guardianship
and government. After a few generations, a new kind of relationship was established;
by virtue of reciprocal services, the slave was considered a secondary, but necessary, member of the family.
of the family.

At times, the sense of common peril gave rise to pacts between heads of families
and the subjugation of neighboring families, the primitive family extended
to form a new civil grouping, a small political state.
The mechanism of its formation is the one we've already seen at work.

Industry gives power, determines competition and creates a need for new elements within the group.

of new elements; hence the increase in families and their federation, hence also the doors
open to vagabonds, defectors and even enemies, subject to certain conditions of
and even defeated enemies. Aristotle's dictum holds true in every precinct;
it's friendship that presides over the founding of the city. But Hobbes' formula is not denied
nevertheless: because man is wolf to man, the enclosure bristles with walls, towers
and other fortifications. Friendship is established, as it is between members of the same household
the same wall; to others, it's enmity, or at the very least caution and distrust
caution and distrust.

Friendship should not be understood as pure friendship, nor enmity as absolute enmity. The
or, as they were called in ancient Greece, barbarians, are not necessarily enemies.
necessarily enemies. But first of all, they are different in morals, language, costume and laws.
costume and laws. What's more, their movements are almost always aimed at a little
for the purpose of rapine. Nevertheless, they can be received as guests and questioned as scholars.
scholars. We answer their questions so that they answer the ones we ask them. Their horses
of their horses or ships is also a great source of curiosity, and sometimes of
greed. Relationships begin with the simplest ones, trade by means of exchange
exchange, since no currency yet exists. These are a kind of international friendship.
But they are precarious and all relative, compared to the causes of enmity always on the verge of
erupting
between people with such different and opposing interests!

Conversely, within each city, if it's true that friendship born of pressing common interests
that true warfare has been relegated to the periphery of this great body.
of this great body, robberies and adulteries are still committed, rival lovers
rival lovers beat each other with their swords, and rival pain-bearers with their fists and knives.
stabbings. Nevertheless, a relative peace prevails. People hate and envy each other, but
for matters of little importance, and on which reconciliation remains easy or possible.

Moreover, to meet the general need for peace and order that is essential to life, but which
which the progress of industry makes imperative, the city, the great civil community, already
naturally divided into families and trades, includes and, if necessary, encourages the formation of
the formation of certain secondary communities, among which citizens distribute themselves
according to their affinities and tastes. These are religious associations, mutual aid brotherhoods
philosophical and literary sects. It goes without saying that the members of each body
cannot be in great sympathy with the members of the neighboring body: sympathy is
between members of the same group, and this is a great benefit. Two brotherhoods
of penitents, one blue, the other grey, can talk in a town, on the day of the votive feast,
two or three quarrels, even a good brawl.
for the greater material and moral benefit of both. More
war is on the outside, the closer and more generous the camaraderie on the inside.
This is the way of man, and the societies that have been able to get through the difficulties of history
precisely those which, knowing by reflection or sensing by instinct these laws of human nature
conformed to them point by point.

A community subsists as long as among its members the causes of friendship and union remain greater than the causes of enmity.
causes of enmity and division. The police and courts are set up to punish
to punish, repress and, if necessary, exclude those in each community who show their
the wolfish face they should reserve for the common enemy. In the same way
or posthumous honours have always served to reward those members of the community
members of the community who have shown themselves to be the most "wolf-like" towards the enemy, or
gods" to their friends and compatriots. Many heroes have been deified in this way,
whether military or civilian.

God's face, wolf's face: the alternating expression of man's face in the presence of man
results from his constitution, his law. Naturally philanthropic, naturally misanthropic
misanthropic, man needs man but is afraid of man.
circumstances alone regulate the interplay of these two feelings, which fight each other but complement each other.

I don't believe they can ever disappear. I think it's foolish to hope so.
The most extensive societies, which founded the narrowest "fraternities", were also the most
terrible for anything that tried to live outside them. This is borne out by memories of the Roman Empire
which, as it expanded across the entire inhabited earth, forgave only its vanquished and crushed the rest.
the rest. Christianity, so gentle to the populations sheltered in its vast bosom, surrendered to the natural violence
natural violence of every instinct when it encountered pagans or Saracens.
Today, English civilization, so moderate, so respectful, so legal towards its citizens,
recognizes neither right nor force outside its own force or right. A curious feature: of all those who
the modern Englishman is personally helpful, hospitable,
to the foreigner, whoever he may be, with whom he has made an alliance.
alliance. His formal will has the power to create such personal acceptances. But they are
are, as we say in law, pure species, and outside of them he believes it his duty to
show wolf's face to all barbarians: his god's face is reserved for the sons of old
England.

We may scoff at this patriotism, this ingenuous nationalism. But it conforms to great physical laws.
laws. It is linked to the very elements of the human race. To create or maintain
a prosperous people, a flourishing civilization, we haven't found anything better.
found anything better.

Don't say that it can contribute to foreign war; it certainly spares civil war, which is the most atrocious of all.
which is the most atrocious of all.

Nature and fortune

If it is conceded that chance does contribute in some small way to our uprightness and intelligence
intelligence, I would argue that we should never mock chance; it is a great simplifier,
a great shortener of quarrels. Dice were sacred among peoples wiser than us.
wiser than us.

Our control over events does not depend on us alone. They are sometimes singularly
easy.

A child's strength may be enough to capture them. Power is often only skill or
happiness. And anything is possible!

46

The great human races, so sensitive to all attractions, know how to bend to fate's disgraces and
difficulties
to the disgraces and difficulties of fate. Wasn't it young Alcibiades, honor and delight of Athens
of Athens, who wallowed and lost himself in the delights of the great king, but laughed with pleasure as
he
Lacedemonian mishmash?

High energies are flexible. The man truly made to savor the joys of life is the one
the one who knows how to do without them with equal glee.

I'm not one of those who laugh at the beautiful illusion the Ancients had about the stars.
Perhaps they knew that their fiery chariots are, in reality, eaten away and consumed by their luminous
life.
of their luminous life; wisely, they didn't see these worlds in themselves, they saw them
in relation to their own lives. There's no doubt that a star is a good emblem
emblem of perennity compared to the existence of the ephemeral. Everything we know
or think we know will hardly destroy the naive relationship of our senses. We do not believe we are
insult science by invoking the star as high, as stable and as eternal
while we roll miserably on the waves. The star provides us with a satisfactory image and approximate
approximate type of relative perfection towards which a man's heart can swell.
High star, stable star, eternal star, to you we flee from violence and trickery,
from the abysses and retreats, from the temptations and corruptions of the sea!

Nature and reason

The instinctive and the unconscious are at the root of human nature.
and evil, it is not all bad. A man with all conscious will would be an automaton

would be an automaton who would resemble a moron.

Let conscious reason lead; it will find no forces to employ other than those which, in the final analysis in the final analysis, the nourishing soil, which we must call corporeal. Those who fail to recognize these living sources of power will be the first to be punished, for he will not use them.

As there is in the human soul an entirely mechanical portion, the condition and support of the other parts.
without which nothing would stand, a portion to which all the laws of the mineral world apply.
mineral world, there is also in us a vegetative province that supports and therefore conditions the sensitive and rational.
sensitive and rational.

If we want to be a good animal, we must comply with the laws of the vegetative soul, just as if we want to be a good animal we must comply with the laws of the rational soul.
if we wish to be a good reasonable animal, or human, we must feel well, that is, feel as a healthy and animal.

The physical world has its laws; human nature has its own, which cannot be invented, but rather discovered.
discovered. The human mind, instead of speculating in the heavens, must look around
to find guidance and direction in the light.

There is a perfect man. I don't mean a mediocre figure in which the faults and qualities
I'm expressing the limit of human power. The
the monstrous, the excessive, the bloated do not pass this limit, even though it is
to say so. They stay far below it. Man cannot conceive of anything beyond this point.
term; that's where he placed the gods.

In short, man is a reasoning animal. This old definition seems to me to be
that can satisfy. Neither morality, nor sociability, nor certainly sentiment are

peculiar to man. All he has is reason; this is what distinguishes him from the rest of nature, without separating him from it.
from the rest of nature.

This nature is represented in him entirely in his body, which has weight, number and measure
like metals, organization like plants, sensibility and movement like animals
animals, and which thus appears the highest flower on earth; his reason is nourished, sharpened, activated
and unceasingly enlightened by the tribute the world pays him through these channels. In a perfect man,

reason, thus conditioned by all of nature, must develop the full extent of its energy
energy in the exact mode in which it cannot interfere with the perfect expansion of a flourishing body and heart.
heart. Reason pushed to excess, drying up the animal, dries up its own sources of development.
development; and as for the exclusive cultivation of the body, it's quite clear that it thickens a reasonable soul
and robs man of his spirit.

Man has been so shaped by fifty centuries of civilization that he has almost lost the idea of
of nature's fundamental enmity. The chorus of things that surround him seems a clear, harmonious
harmonious, benevolent whole, provided he doesn't live there alone.

If he trembles in the desert, it's from loneliness.

If the desert is populated, the man is immediately reassured. He undoubtedly has faith in it; but it also comes to him
a kind of rapid contagion, a feeling of confidence and abandonment in the solidity
in the solidity, constancy, richness and generosity of his Universe.

The world's machine is not driven by the words spoken before it or the phrases
cranks, but by living creatures: needs, interests, real forces full of appetite.
real forces full of appetite.

We know that the world is developing. But we also know that its field of evolution
of evolution. The slightest modification requires thousands of centuries. In human
men, the bark of morals falls off easily enough as it's replaced; but it's only the bark, and what do we know about it?
But that's just the bark, and what do we know about the essentials of mankind that have changed in the last four thousand years?

To be right is yet another way in which man eternalizes himself: to be right and to change common
into a small number of coherent, reasonable propositions,
when you succeed on just a few points, it's a masterpiece of energy.

Being right isn't enough. But it is essential, and that's the place to start. And if you've
error, you have to retrace your steps to catch up with the point from which you can
instead of going round in circles, going backwards and stalling.

Nothing is more delightful to the human mind than to test a law by the testimony of an independent, spontaneous fact.
independent and spontaneous fact, some fact subsequent to the formulation of the law.

Qn is confirmed in this profound feeling that reasoning is not dreaming, and that there are mysterious
mysterious correspondences between the views of our mind and the confused current of real
things.

I've always considered reason to be a useful instrument whose structure defines its scope. It certainly doesn't see everything, but it's not worth tearing your eyes out because the philosophy of optics reproaches these organs for some flaw in their construction. To despair of the resources reason is as vain as expecting everything from it and hanging everything on it.

48

As soon as they become our mistresses, the faculties, which are blind forces
the crown, without sharing it; but the pleasure of intelligence and reason is not to reign
is not to reign, it is not to power, but simply to see what reigns or what must reign, and to
to assign to each activity the place that is most appropriate to it. If it is easy for reason to
give the sceptre to the most worthy, it is superfluous and impossible for it to arrogate it
unduly.

...Reason, i.e. the intelligence that moderates, measures or presses all passions.

Only the weak exclude reason from feeling. Among the strong, conviction is all the warmer
the warmer it is based on more clearly noted motives.

Reason and sentiment, supporting and regulating each other, are the safeguard and hope of the world.
safeguard and hope of the world.

49

Part Two
Principles

The truth

Yes, Sir, yes, Madam, it is because "the speech is hard" that its effect will be gentle;
it is because the book is "bitter to the tongue" that it will be tonic and healing below.

Roadside signposts don't put their instructions in a soft, flowery style: they display the style of their utility.
the style of their utility. Sharp, direct, insistent and authoritarian, they don't say: "If I'm wrong
if I'm wrong, they don't doubt themselves, they don't apologize for rudely throwing
the arrows of direction and the figures of distance. But does the traveller
complain about it? If he has the heart to philosophize, he thanks the author of profitable brutalities

which he doesn't even feel tyrannized by.

It's up to him to slow down or press on, to follow or change his direction. The millstone
says only in clear terms what is, and what he must take into account. The more
the more the precise data limits thought, and the more, by virtue of this very narrow
of the heart, the wishes of the imagination, the needs, conveniences and personal interests
will gain security and be able to give themselves career. An uncertain indication, a vague or
vague or false, by appearing to flatter the walker's arbitrariness, will restrict his freedom of movement
his movements and his rest, and diminish his real powers, for the risks attached to the consequences
consequences of a nonchalant or capricious itinerary will be multiplied by the
insufficient information.

It's a big mistake to think that contingencies, as they say, can be more easily accommodated
more easily with a loose, floating principle: on the contrary, any indecision in principles
complicates the study of facts, as well as their treatment.
introduced at the only point from which a little light could have come, and the complexities of the earth

shadows in the sky.

Truth, a harsh but clear sun, is content to establish from on high what we need to know and think
before acting.
before acting. It shows the good, it marks the bad, it distinguishes the proportions according
in the infinite variety of our human cases.
human cases. Once enlightened in this way, man is far from having solved the problems of his practical
life,
but he does have the means to solve them, and if, as happens all too frequently, he finds himself
between evils, he will be better able to discern which is the lesser, and his efforts will be
to escape the worst, which is perhaps the greatest point of governing oneself or others.
or others.

Not only is truth defended by what is naturally general, elevated,
abstract and foreign to man, but to decide to climb to it requires a generous impulse of thought
beyond the present, a broad calculation of the future. To adhere to this truth
that everything veils, it also requires an effort of will that silences many instincts.

50

Truth (I'm not saying sincerity, I'm saying the whole truth, the agreement of a language and a thought
with external realities), truth can be something other than the supreme voluptuousness of the
intelligence.
of intelligence: it is sovereign skill, all-powerful strength.

Sincerity is not truth. The most upright intention and the strongest will cannot

that what is is not.

Let us not underestimate any virtue, but do justice to the virtues of the obvious. There is no
smile, grimace or chattering wit can stand against them. The decisions
decisions they entail are serious, sometimes painful, in the life of the mind.
but the service they render is such that they win out over all.

Truth stands on its own. But there are bitter truths and sweet truths. Some are useful,
some dangerous. Some must be reserved for the wise, others are suitable for everyone's
food for all.

Some purely oratorical and mystical revolutionaries may feel that, fable or truth,
is always good enough for the people! We believe that the people's needs are no less demanding
less demanding than the elite. They need truth like they need bread. Lies
poisons a people as cleanly as potassium cyanide.
cyanide.

Disdain that doesn't express itself doesn't act. On the contrary, an error or a lie that you don't bother
unmasked gradually acquire the authority of truth.

Strength

There are tyrannical weaknesses, wicked debilities and worthy vanquished, just as there are victorious
benefactors.
there are victorious do-gooders, heroes of energy and power to whom mankind owes immense advances

immense progress, colossi of health and strength who have earned the blessing of past and future.
of the future. Strength in itself, stripped of its adventitious and circumstantial characteristics, strength
which is not yet at the service of either good or evil, naked strength is in itself a good, and a very
precious one, and a very great one, since it is the most precious of all.
very precious, and very great, since it is the expression of the activity of being. It is foolish to ignore
to ignore its benefits.

We must never tire of repeating it, to discourage malignant sophistry: force by itself, reduced to itself, is
a good thing.
reduced to itself, is good. This is not to say that it is always good, or that there is no such thing as good.
that there is no greater good.

Good in itself, it is also capable of the greatest good, such as defending the homeland
punish crime, avenge honor or protect innocence.

But as it is capable of anything, it needs a rule as its first guarantee and, placed at the service of the best
cause, an order.
service of the best cause, an order. Order helps to make it fully and completely
completely effective. But order also keeps it from serving what it claims to serve;
order prevents it from turning against what it holds dear. Any disordered force

is exposed to this peril.

To moderate force, we need Reason, i.e. a sense of measure and intellectual proportion.
that civic sense which adds to the higher orders of the spirit I know not what

principle of cordiality, of bonhomie, I would dare say of charity, which does not want the death of the guilty party, but which does want, and dare to say, the death of the guilty party.
the guilty party, but wants, and is willing, to amend him.

There also remains that clarity, that frankness, the natural consequence of rectitude of mind, which allows for neither hypocrisy nor disguise.
that allows no hypocrisy or disguise, but goes straight ahead, visor up and chest uncovered,
the quiet serenity that befits those who have freely assumed noble missions.

The theories of force are not at all in contradiction with the doctrine of solidarity, and, in any case
in any case, human mutual aid needs to be strong to protect itself or to be protected
against violence.

If there is only strength in the world, it seems essential to be strong.
if, as we believe, there is something better, and much better, it is even more necessary to be strong and powerful to save the world.
to be strong and powerful in order to save or develop these real goods.

The order

Since there can be no figure without the line that encloses it and the line that contains it, as soon as Being begins to distance itself from its opposite, as soon as Being is, it has its form, it has its order, and this is what it is.
it is this very thing of which it is limited that constitutes it. What existence is without essence? What is Being without law? At every level of the ladder, Being weakens when order weakens; it dissolves
if order no longer holds it.

Order is only a means. It's a starting point. Restoring order restores an atmosphere
for both mind and body. This order makes the work possible or
better. It guarantees duration, and provides auxiliaries or protectors.

The human rule does not consist in killing, destroying or annihilating the subject.
on the contrary, to develop it by keeping it on track.

The need to subordinate in order to coordinate and order - there's no orator's mumbo-jumbo
that can go against this mathematics!

Conforming to order shortens and facilitates the work Contradicting or discussing order is a waste of time.
is a waste of time.

As we've said, order is superior justice.

For historical and political order, having is nothing, if you can't keep too.

In war as in peace, order is the most precious of all goods. With its false harshness,
with its apparent rigor, it saves lives, just as it measures and uses efforts.

The soldier who complains about order is an enemy of himself. The blind kindness that choruses with this soldier
is an enemy of the soldier. An unconscious and involuntary enemy.
if it leads to death?

Precisely because he is ungrateful and light-hearted, because forgetfulness and instability are commonplace to him,
man realized early on that in Time, which changes without warning, he had to look for a way out.

immovable reference points, invariable points of support, whenever he wishes to achieve a
that he wants to be faithful to his goal and his love.

I'm deliberately writing this last word, which expresses only the feelings of individuals; for if strong passions
strong passions have their anniversary rites, if a return of certain dates leads to a natural return
natural return of thought to the painful or joyous mysteries of the life of the heart, all the more so
reason, when it is no longer a question of a single being, but of a society, a religion, a cause,
will it be necessary to eternalize happy or unhappy memories in their own time?

REMEMBER: this is the starting point of all order and law.

Authority

Once the first wave of enthusiasm has passed, no order can emerge except from
authority.

The nature of authority

The idea that authority could be built from below would never have occurred to our wise grandparents.

wise grandparents.

In fact, authority is neither built from below nor from above.

Authority is born. In individuals, families and peoples, it is a gift in which the will of men has very little to do with it.
has very little to do with it.

The most vulgar observation is in complete agreement here with the Catholic text omnis potestas a Deo. In one of his oldest "letters to Françoise", M. Marcel Prévost recalls to his niece how, after passing her baccalaureate, she was able to force the secretary of the Faculty in defiance of university regulations and state laws. You have a great gift, Françoise, it's authority," observed Uncle Marcel sententiously. Did he think he was observe? Did he follow through on what he observed?

Authority, grasped like this at birth, is something simple and pure. Some human others lack it.

Leaving aside those who know only how to endure, the man of freedom, recognizable by the pride of a heart that nothing can tame, differs from the man characterized by dignity, who inspires respect above all else.
the man of authority differs from the other two. His freedom naturally imposes itself on his dignity is radiant, inspiring and transporting. It's not respect or admiration it is enthusiastic docility that responds to it.

Far from being irrational, instinctive wishes move faster than conscious reason, and clear-sighted logic clairvoyant logic is no more absent than from the passions of a great love. The author of La Vie tells us that at the first sight of Beatrice, his heart began to beat impetuously, which Dante develops and explains in the following terms: "... The spirit of life that resides in the most secret vault of the heart began to tremble with such force that the movement was felt in my my smallest veins, and, trembling, it said these words: Ecce deus fortior me, qui veniens dominabitur me. This god is more wrong than I am, he will dominate me. Then the animal spirit, standing in the high vault where all sentient spirits will bring their perception, began to wonder

and, addressing the spirits of sight in particular, said these words: Apparuit jam beatitudo nostra. Our beatitude has appeared...". We must reread this penetrating and poetic analysis analysis from an age when the lazy sophisms of Germany and Jewry had not imposed a ridiculous philosophy of the unconscious on the European West. What was unconscious was brought to consciousness. What escaped the first grasp of reason,

a more subtle reason snatched it from the darkness.

This explanation of the strong presciences of a loving heart, as given by Dante,
can be applied to the instinctive transports of a soul obedient to the authority it deems
that it will be good for him to serve this force, conceived as useful and beneficent
whose order presages protection, justice or victory. She
tastes the beginnings of a mysterious good. What's the sign that she knows it? That's the tricky part.
Some military leaders are obeyed by genius, others by bravery, others by a kind of mystical faith.
mystical faith. The outward and brilliant gifts of a Condé may add the magic of example.
example, but generals carried in litter radiated the same prestige.

Henry Fouquier, who was one of the Thousand, liked to tell how the aging Garibaldi fanaticized his bands
bands by telling them in a half-voiced voice, from the back of his carriage where rheumatism confined him.
Gentlemen, forward! So many passions of hope and confidence lie dormant in the human soul!
human soul! It doesn't take much to bring them out, but nothing is indispensable, and no convention
no convention, no arrangement, no artifice of will can take the place of the first natural gift.

Authority is of the same order as virtue, genius or beauty.

The most ingenious devices have never replaced born authority...

The French of the 10th century rallied around the race that, for a hundred years or more, had always effectively defended them.
had always effectively defended them. Where had this race come from, and from what heaven had it fallen upon the country?
the country? Whether Saxon immigrants or native peasant lords, or even descendants of Parisian
Parisian bourgeois, scholarship never ceases to debate. There's no questioning the authority they gradually acquired
the benefits of their dynasty and its constant honor.

For centuries, it has expressed a power to protect and uplift, and it embodies all that the hearts and minds
that the hearts and minds of men, isolated or united, expect, hope and believe from a true authority.
authority.

True authority is naturally wise; foolish authority is inconceivable. Emptied
of authority does not, in fact, mean only the power and great power exercised by one man
by one man or by a group of men, but moreover it encloses the knowledge of the object
which this power is exercised and applied. As authority grows, so does this knowledge itself.
develops. The more perfect the authority, the more it presupposes the clarity and accuracy of this knowledge.
and more proportionate to it.

Authority would not be an eternal political necessity if, in parallel with this guiding instinct,

the soul of rulers, there were not in the souls of subjects and citizens an instinct for obedience
instinct of obedience, or esprit de suite, as Richelieu put it, which is the living expression of the crowds' greatest interest
interest of the masses: to be governed and governed well, in the right way, with firmness.

54

The conditions of true authority: educating leaders

The development of so-called modern civilization tends to give material forces
advantage over moral forces.

If we rely on it to bring about social justice or a softening of morals, we're setting ourselves up for considerable disappointment!
considerable disappointment! This civilization does not equalize fortunes or conditions.
On the contrary, its complexity is constantly widening the gap between people. It does not liberate
rather, the authority of science and industry tends to establish new races of slaves.
of slaves. Lastly, far from calming and reconciling, its necessities are so rigorous that they seem to cut at right angles, destroy or destroy.
seem to cut at right angles, destroy or deny all that is human.

Neither the game of supply and demand that constituted capitalism, nor the principle of nationalities
which created our armed peace, nor the class warfare with which the insurgent masses
to starving capitalism, could spread an atmosphere of "sheepfold" in the modern world.
We'd rather be driven back to the home of the unsocial wolves, and forced to live, by class or race, according to the rules of the world.
categories or races, according to wolf custom. The hereditary veneer of morals
traditions are fading away, and crime statistics show what inevitably follows
crime statistics show what inevitably follows.

Consider the progress of athletics (which in a well-regulated society could make an admirable
school of discipline and elegance), the passion (excellent in itself) to prevail
prevail in these violent games, the new instruments created by science and its applicators
this multiplication of old forces and new means at the service of unbridled
unbridled energies have only to give way: the moralist, at a thousand signs, sees brutality
the rebirth of brutality.

As for the language of our contemporaries, I'm talking about the best, the well-bred, if not the well-educated.
men and women, it's back to the primitive onomatopoeia, if we "let life
to life", to forces, to destinies.

In a regime of brutality, it's not leaders or orders, or even order with its necessary hierarchy, that are

lacking.
hierarchy. The September massacres had leaders. It was not
that the shooters of the Duc d'Enghien or Mgr Darboy lacked orders. We should not complain
complain about our times in this respect.

Class differences are more marked than they were half a century ago, and the arrogance and
arrogance and despotism of the authorities. What's missing is the light in the minds
the light that is the sign of their right to lead. Leaders remain and their power
and their power increases, but they are barbaric leaders left to the impulses of passion or interest.
interest. They command, they lead, because their troops want them to, but they command badly
but they command badly and lead badly, because they have not learned.

So, even more than the proletarian masses for whom we feign such keen interest
interest, they are the truly disinherited.

The intellectual and moral treasure that was theirs to inherit has been scorned and ultimately lost.
ultimately lost. This was the spirit of the liberal democracy that disrupted the country from above.
the country from above; borrowing the voice of progress, pretending to possess the promises of the
future.

the only instrument of progress, tradition, and the only seed of the future, tradition.
of the future, which is the past.

The history of the Third Republic may suffice to show the disadvantage of surrendering
legislation, armies, economics, diplomacy and all forms of authority and influence to minds
to minds without direction or culture, to hearts without control or dignity.

The symmetrical history of Conservative England, where all who governed and served in high positions
had undergone the long and hard intellectual and moral preparation of the old
of Greek verse and Latin discourse, verifies how certain it is that the real happiness of peoples
the real happiness of peoples depends on the proper training of their leaders. The conqueror's sword
conqueror, the pioneer's staff, even the stockbroker's pencil - all these modalities of force and cunning
of force and cunning can and must achieve great things, provided they have spent the necessary time
under the tutelage of an educator. Whatever is taken away from the ferule is not taken away from the
ferule
nor to the authority that holds it: it is taken away from the entire mass of the people; it is the nation
and the human race.

The diminution of the intellectual and moral commons is a loss for everyone: the small will lose as much
as the great.
will lose as much as the great.

They will even lose much more than the great, for what perfects, refines and elevates the great is, for the benefit of others, the most precious and often the only guarantee against the abuses of power to which the big are exposed.
against the abuses of power to which greatness exposes it. Certain nuances of virtue and of virtue and honor, certain persuasive accents of the voice that commands, are the direct fruits of education alone.

It's the same with religion.

Whoever said that we needed a religion for the people was talking a lot of nonsense. You need religion religion, you need an education, you need a set of powerful brakes for the people's leaders, for their advisors, for their leaders, by virtue of the role of direction and support they are called upon to play: if the fury of the human beast is to be feared by all, it must be feared by all. to be feared by all, they should be feared in proportion to the beast's greater power and ability to ravage ravage a wider field of action.

Not all freedom is appropriate in every state; each state depends on its historical background and geographical configuration, just as each man depends on his ancestors and his country. country. These dependencies are salutary and tutelary, since they gave life, sustain it and preserve it. and whoever shirks them dies. Freedom varies with time and place, but there is no but there is no state that can last without a sovereign authority.

If, then, we wish to speak accurately, it is not liberty that is general, necessary, of ecumenical, primitive right, but liberty that is general, necessary, of ecumenical, primitive right. ecumenical, primitive and human right; it is authority.

Exercise of authority: Power

The property of power resembles other properties: it results from work, work done, "well done". well done". Bare force can be applied to good and matt to construction and destruction. When it has done good, when it has built, it has the merit, the prestige and the glory. prestige and glory, it also sees the birth of that product called authority.

The lack of power is like the vacancy of a field. He who will, takes it; he who can, holds it.

When power is vacant, it is, as Joan of Arc used to say, great pity on the kingdom! And it's great misery. To take power in such a case, when you have the strength to do so, is quite simply an act of charity or humanity. A people needs a leader like a man needs bread. No not only does this re-establish the right of the original occupier, it also imposes a rigorous duty strict obligation on the part of the occupier. When citizens are threatened by the enemy

by the enemy, you must command them if you can. When there's disorder in the streets, you have to bring
order there if you can.

Power isn't an idea, it's a fact, and we believe in this fact when it's felt.
criticism of the world can do nothing against the strength of a conqueror.

Most moralists, who are confused minds, have judged that power corrupts man's heart.
man's heart. When power is elevated and lasts, when it lasts a little, 'the effect is quite the opposite.
responsibilities are learned and their experience perfects rather than spoils.
instead of spoiling.

Freedom

Freedom is not at the beginning, but at the end. It is not at the root, but in the flowers and fruits of human nature.
of human nature, or to put it better, of human virtue. We become freer
proportion as we become better. You have to become better. Our men thought they could claim the prize of effort
effort with a famous Declaration of Rights, by putting up posters in their town halls and schools
in their town halls and schools, in their ministries and churches, that this prize can be acquired without effort. But posting
that everyone is born a millionaire worth a million?

Would you call it a right to freedom? The right to a million couldn't be more vain.

Freedom, a metaphysical principle, is one thing: freedoms are another. The will of the
sum, of individual wills, is one thing; the general will, expression of a nation's
of the general interest of a nation, a race, a country, is another thing entirely.

The freedom of the madman is called madness, that of the fool is called stupidity, that of the bandit is called banditry, that of the traitor is called treason, and so on,
treason, and so on. To say that freedoms limit each other is absolutely right.
of the savage state or the state of anarchy: it simply means that the strong oppress or exploit the weak as long as the weak are free.
exploit the weak until such time as the weak revolt against the strong, and any victims
have found a safe way to shoot and machine-gun their tormentors at will.
at will. Freedom conceived as a regime or a principle is chaos, and generally
painful.

Citizens who have thought things through will not be intimidated by words. They
define freedom as a power or a force, a force or a power that is worth what its subjects and
and its object. The etemal ludicrousness of the 18th and 19th centuries consists in taking freedom to be a rule or a goal when it is not.
for a rule or a goal when it is merely a means or a matter.

Freedom lives in few men.

Real freedom means authority. The freedom to test creates the authority of the head of the family. The freedom
creates the real power of the social authorities who live and reside on the spot.
authorities. Religious freedom recognizes the authority of spiritual laws and the internal hierarchy.

of a religion. Trade union and professional freedom enshrine the authority of disciplines and regulations within guilds and companies.

These are observable facts.

If, however, instead of observing, we go inside ourselves to reflect, we realize that the very nature of positive freedom is that which is not conceived in relation to an obstacle to be overcome, that which freedom is power.

Social, it is exercised in society, and its point of application is not marble, like a sculptor's power. the power of a sculptor, nor the machine, like the power of a mechanic, but the people engaged with us in social life.

So what is freedom? Power.

He who can do nothing at all is not free at all. He who can mediocrely is mediocrely mediocrely free. He who can infinitely is also infinitely free. One form of power is wealth. Another is influence, physical strength, intellectual and moral power. intellectual and moral strength. On what are these various powers exercised? On men. And to whom does this power belong? To men. When human freedom is at its is at its most powerful, and has found human objects to apply and impose impose itself, what name does it take? Authority. Authority, then, is only freedom at its most perfect. perfected.

Far from the idea of authority contradicting the idea of freedom, it is, on the contrary, its completion and complement.
complement. The freedom of a father is authority. The freedom of a religious is an authority. The freedom of an association, the freedom of a commune, of a community of a commune, of a province.

When we want the State to respect private initiative in the economic sphere, we're basically asking it to respect what private initiative can do.
respect what Le Play so beautifully called: social authorities. All real real, defined and practical freedoms are authorities. Freedom opposed to authority; the freedom

which consists not only in not being acted upon by others, but also in not acting upon them, this neutral freedom
cannot be reconciled with nature or with the order of life.

Right and law

I have always believed that the privilege of rights also represents the privilege of duties.

The experience of the nature of things establishes that the domain of common law is very restricted and that
that there is, on the contrary, a multitude of private rights. Each group of men, each with its own deserves special treatment. Those who are "privileged" want to be treated
in accordance with his privilege, and when this wish is not granted, the subject suffers, firstly in the body of which he is a part, and secondly in the body of which he is a member.
the body of which he is a part, and secondly within himself, as a result of the discredit and slackness which, of necessity, affects this body.

To assert itself and even to subsist, law needs to be asserted, supported and published.
supported and published. It presupposes activity or fades, little by little, into the blood and ashes of slaughtered men.
and ashes of slaughtered men and burnt buildings, then in the sublime cold of those empty spaces
of those empty spaces where the voice of the most vehement rhetorician is extinguished.

This is what rhetors will never understand. They spend their lives personifying "the law".
But men of action and men of analysis wonder what this person without a subject, this right without a substratum, can be.
person without a subject, this right without a living substratum: it's their turn not to understand the antithesis
which is everywhere, this right that is opposed to force, this force that we want to make the opposite of right!
the opposite of right! We might as well contrast triangle and color. There are coloured triangles, there can be colours
colors spread out in triangular surfaces. I can't conceive of a right that would be
be separated from a moral or material person in whom it exists, i.e. a force.
a force.

There is the force, more or less strong, that is right; there is the force, more or less strong, that is wrong; but the being of reason that, without the right, is wrong, is right.
being of reason who, without any force, would be right or have the right, that's what I can't conceive.
conceive.

Law, which needs force to be recognized, still needs force to be.

Legal deduction starts from the principles of the just and the unjust; its first notions already represent the second or third power.
already represent the second or third power of a high abstraction, and its definitions, so vast
necessarily floating when it comes to adapting their generality to practical life.
practical life: between the multitude of particular facts, often very diverse, and sometimes
the mind is more or less inevitably led to lose sight of the impersonal reasons
to make its choice, or even to direct its attention.
impersonal reasons, others appear: the personal motive emerges, active and vigilant, and the idea of law
and the idea of right remains enlightened and guided only by the idea of the self, that self which is not without rights,
but which claims to have them all, and instinctively governs the steps of thought towards
its own interests, sometimes understood in a tyrannical sense, but always, to some degree,
unconcerned with good order, unconsciously in favor of some kind of anarchy.

Heaven forbid that Law should lead to anarchy, when on the contrary it seeks to regulate and pacify it!
and pacify it! But he was born a warrior. In my opinion, the preference given to the legal method
over the empirical method should suit flourishing societies, firmly founded on principles
principles that burst forth from all sides and are obeyed by all.

Separate the man from his family, his nation, his profession, tell him he is a king, tell him who is
who God is, and intoxicate him with the wrinkle of Justice.
the wrongs done to him, and what indulgences he will make for the wrongs done to others!
to others! This judge is too much of a party, too interested and too passionate, for it to be reasonable
to theoretically refer any dispute to him. He who assumes all rights
begins by imposing all duties on the whole world, without forgetting the sanctions
corresponding to any breach.

This is the true folly of revolutionary individualism, whether political, social or moral. It
It is impossible that an animal as sensitive, as sad and as vulnerable as man, once
once placed on the inner altar erected for him by liberal dogma, not to believe himself, nine times out of ten,
nine times out of ten, the creditor of his fellow human beings and of the universe.
infinite debtor!

This illusion of a claim on society can only be encouraged by the absurd
metaphysics of Rights.

According to a venerable maxim, law is made by the operation of the sovereign (constitutione regis), by the acceptance of the subject (consensus) and by the act of the sovereign (constitutione regis).
the acceptance of the subject (consensu populi). No doubt our jurists mistranslate these words. They think that consensu means express consent, explicit ratification, formal approval
more or less voted or written.

Historically, politically, human genius is freer and more expeditious.
is less encumbered by formalities and words. By consensus, we mean de facto adherence, sometimes sometimes noisy, like the acclamation that followed the coronation of kings, sometimes a simple approving murmur
which Homer follows the words of the chiefs. EPEYTHY MISAN AXAIOI. But in the
the vast majority of cases, in the case of which we don't make up stories, support consists
the fact of not raising any important contradiction, of understanding, of executing.

Say: "Mr. Subject, here's a law that will oblige you. Do you want it? Are you
sure you want it? We need your signature", it's like trying to inspire him to say "no", to argue with him.

to say "no", to argue ad infinitum to get out of the way. Hatred of the new and the spirit of contradiction
The hatred of the new and the spirit of contradiction are strong enough in man not to place public salvation at their mercy.

But it remains true that the law must be made to be easily obeyed. A law must be acceptable.
The law is not the law when its wording is enough to provoke people to break it. It wants
natural and prompt assent.

The party attacking a law that no one defends can be right or wrong, that's not the point.
question: the author of such a law will nonetheless have committed the political error of not waiting for better
and more favorable dispositions of the public mind. His law
is nothing more than a state of siege decree that he will have to support with arms in hand, without the right to complain or protest.
to complain or wonder.

The spirit of modern laws is far removed from the spirit of the laws that govern the facts of real life, and these real facts, not being able to care about the rag of paper that distorts them or the spider that weaves its web.
spider weaving its web in the legislative brain, continued to develop according to the weights, measures and numbers
weights, measures and numbers of which they are composed.

Qn says: "But the fact can be the crime! The fact can be monstrosity! Fact can be
error!"

Surely: realist politics and morality do not give bare, raw facts for the

types and models of life. But they do recommend two points:

First, to consider the laws by which actual facts are chained, for while facts may be
be vicious or criminal, the laws of vice and crime are not.
the order of causes and effects that presides over even evil realities is not in the least bad.
even excellent to know and calculate, the knowledge and calculation that alone enable action.

Secondly, action can only be serious and useful if it is aimed at a definite and just goal.
and just. It's not enough to have an "ideal" in mind, or to have some idea of "right" and "duty".
"and "duty": this moralism, this jurism, this idealism must conform to the ideal moral and legal truth.
moral and legal truth. In other words, you have to be right first.

60

A false idea is a false idea. To impose it on the world on the pretext that the world
must be governed by ideas is an absurd pretense whose application is bound to be
criminal or disastrous. Ideas are not equal. Not all rights are valid.
valid. And not all ways of regulating morals are worthy of respect. The modern error
comes from this brutal assimilation of contrary systems dreamt up by the human brain.
It's a convenient error, certainly, for orators and litigants. It authorizes
to support any cause. It allows them to please all audiences. But
the people who rely on it pay the price.

Property

Property is the natural safeguard of man, an industrious rather than a reasonable animal.
his needs, his weakness, the discontent he brings from the cradle, make it his close
make it a narrow duty to transform what surrounds him. Pascal is wrong to mock these
children who say: this corner is mine.

We wouldn't say me if we didn't say mine. Without property, man is condemned to death.

To possess is to command, to dispose of oneself, to be able to resist others, to exercise influence, if only by reaction.
influence, if only by reaction.

Property liberates existence and confers authority at least over the goods of the earth and the fruits of labour.
fruits of labor.

Heredity

Nature proceeds most commonly by imitation and repetition.
innovations, whims and initiatives. In these cases, she acts with extreme vigor.

When it pleases her to give birth to a man of war among peaceful magistrates, or a sailor
a sailor from a family of winegrowers, the new vocation is marked strongly enough, it is served
by a will firm enough to break down all resistance. But this resistance,
these difficulties, have a silver lining. These trials are natural examinations, allowing the strong
predestined
predestined, but rejecting the others in the hereditary condition most suited to them,
because it provides them with defense and shelter.

As a means of action towards a future, heredity is the straightest and simplest of all.

Its general usefulness results from the destiny of the producer endowed with reason, who reproduces
before dying.
dies.

Human life would be shamefully short if nature had not provided societies with a procedure
to transmit the fruits of labor through blood.

The impersonal flame of which man is the repository only passes through him to others,
but delegates to the children he procreates a power over the goods he has procreated like them, and very
often for them.
very often for them. The inert posterity that leaves his hands will be vivified by his living posterity.
posterity.

61

When his great sons begin to fertilize his inheritance, any worker who is a little in love
truly feels that he is about to conquer death twice. The power to bequeath one's remains
gives the activity of a full life its highest natural laurel.

It's worth noting that medieval Christian societies, imbued with a supernatural sense of future life
of the future, were always extremely sensitive to the earthly reward of the father in the son.
the son. They sang, with all their soul, of Abraham et semini ejus in secula.

Our various royal and imperial races come from nations ardently convinced of the reality of the
kingdom of heaven.
of the kingdom of heaven: how could less believing peoples pay less attention to the
less attention to the carnal desire for hereditary duration? It's their only defense against time.
time: it's the only anchor they have to cast over the abyss of the future. In a pinch, hereditary ambitions
hereditary ambitions could have been weakened by a sudden rise in celestial hopes; would the opposite

be understandable?
understandable?

We can reason as follows:

If some God hidden in the secret of hearts or hovering over the interplanetary abyss is watching, motionless and mute, ardent and all-powerful, to the development of humanity's efforts, it is his very law
law that he verifies in things and men; he can only bless the multiplied effect.

But if the spaces are empty, and if the human heart is not itself assisted by any "untimely consolation consolation", all the joys of being and all the benefits of life seem more exposed to the
to the erosion of time and the blows of death.
more precious in the solitary immensity of perpetual destitution.
personal effort becomes more sacred, perhaps! Threatened thought clings
philosophy of order and knowledge of the laws of its preservation.
preservation. Whether or not this order succumbs, the believer retains the refuge of the Divine City.
who no longer believes suffers the catastrophe of all that his dream disputed with death.

The duty of inheritance

To justify what common sense and custom forcefully maintain, let's not speak of right, but of duty.
right, but duty.

Duty to bequeath and test.

Duty to inherit.

Those we call disinherited or proletarians sometimes hear us preach that this is not
from their point of view. It is fair and beneficial for everyone.

The good that settles in a natural or legal family may have dubious sources: it is redeemed
redeems and moralizes itself by its fixity, by the firm benefit it establishes around it by regulating
conditions of life, by distributing work, by reassuring, by preparing a solid base
for future generations.

There is no difference between the damage caused to nature by the death of a beautiful animal, followed by
the return of its elements to universal dust, and the destruction of any fortune
when its creator dies.

There is a dry loss for society as well as for nature, forced to begin again a long and painful work.
labor.

Successful social organizations are those that prevent these realities from resolving into nothingness
and help to keep them from dying altogether: these purveyors of life, being the born enemies of
enemies of destruction, have made inheritance a respected institution, and wills,
a kind of sacrament.

Tradition

Tradition means transmission.

Tradition brings together the forces of soil and blood. You keep it even when you leave your homeland,
as an eternal temptation to return.

True tradition is critical, and without these distinctions, the past serves no purpose, its successes ceasing
to be examples of the future.
successes cease to be examples, and setbacks cease to be lessons.

In all traditions, as in all legacies, a reasonable person does and must deduct the liabilities.
deduct the liabilities.

Tradition is not inertia, its opposite; heredity is not nepotism, its counterfeit.

All traditions have had a beginning, and feelings of monarchical loyalty, while they go back a long way
go back very far, they don't go back indefinitely: what began can begin again
What began can begin again; what had one point of departure can find a second.

The opposition of reason and tradition is equivalent to the antithesis of reality and idea, or of art and
nature.
the art of nature, and can be likened to the opposition between vinegar and oil, sweet and bitter, fluid
and liquid.
bitter, fluid and firm, in a cosmogony of childlike peoples.

Part Three
Civilization

What is civilization?

Man is an heir

Few words are more widely used, and few are less defined. Civilization
a state of softened mores. At other times, we mean the ease and frequency
frequency of relations between men. We still imagine that to be civilized is to have railways
railroads and talking on the telephone. In other cases, at the very least, it means not eating your own
kind.
eating one's own kind. We shouldn't absolutely despise these slightly different ways
of hearing the same word, for each is precious: each represents an ongoing acceptance
of usage, which is the master of the meaning of words.

To find the true definition of a word is not to contradict usage, but to order it;
it's explaining it, bringing it into line with itself. There's a kind of sensual pleasure in appearing
come into this troubled and vague environment to introduce light and unity.

Dictionaries are too busy writing to be seriously concerned with this. The
only little lexicon I have in front of me as I write gets by just fine, and I don't think its fellow
and I don't think his colleagues are doing much better. I copy it: "Civilize, render
civilize, polish mores, give civilization. Civilization, action of civilizing, state of being civilized.
civilized. Civilizer, civilized. Civilisable, that can be civilized." And that's all there is to it. Not a word
word. The only small light provided by this ingenious lexicographer is in "polir les moeurs" ("to polish
morals"), which sheds little light on the subject.
which sheds little light on the subject. We could go through countless volumes
volumes without getting any further. Perhaps it's better to focus our attention,
think about the societies we call barbaric and savage, compare them, see their similarities and differences

their similarities and differences, and try to draw some conclusions.

I will spare you this task of analysis, which is likely to seem tiresome, and will only
and submit to you only the result.

This one seems to me to stand up quite well on its own merits.

Doesn't it seem to you that the true common character of every civilization consists in one fact and one
fact alone?
and only one fact, very striking and very general? The individual who comes into the world in a
"civilization" finds incomparably more than he brings. A disproportion that must be called
infinite has been established between each individual's own value and the accumulation of values
in the midst of which he emerges.

The more a civilization prospers and becomes more complex, the more these latter values increase and,
even
even if (which is difficult to know) the value of each newborn human were to increase from
from generation to generation, the progress of the surrounding social values would still be quite

the difference between their enormous total and any individual ratio.
whatever it may be.

It follows from this that a civilization has two supports. First, it is a capital, then it is a transmitted
transmitted capital. Capitalization and tradition are the two inseparable terms of the idea of
civilization. Capital... But it goes without saying that we're not talking about pure finance. What makes
up
can be material, but it can also be moral.

Industry, in the broadest sense of the word, i.e. the transformation of nature, i.e. the work of man, i.e.
the creation of wealth.
man's work, i.e. his life, does not have the sole aim of changing the face of the world;
it changes man himself, it perfects him, just as the work and the tool perfect the worker
the worker, as the worker and the tool perfect the tool. The capital we're talking about
is obviously the result of this simultaneous triple metamorphosis.

The "savage" who does nothing, or only the bare necessities of life, leaves the forest
the forest, the prairie and the bush their original appearance. He adds nothing to the facts of nature.
of nature. He does not create, by adding to them, a large capital of material wealth. If he has
instruments or weapons, it is in very small numbers and in an art that is as summary as it is primitive...
But this art, being very basic, does not require, as does any slightly developed
relations between neighbors, congeners and compatriots. It
no doubt, as in all human societies, it does contract rudimentary mores.
without richness or complexity. Cooperation is weak, the division of labor mediocrely advanced.
arts and sciences are what industry and mores are. All social capital
is reduced to its simplest expression: neither for clothing, nor for housing, nor for food
nor for food, the individual obtains from the societies that form him anything more
essential supplies or care. Iron was ignored for a long time.
savages who have no idea of fire.

But the particular assets of the savage state have the added misery of being fragile and rarely
to last. It's the hut that has to be rebuilt over and over again. It's the belt or
of dry bark. It's the supplies to be gathered daily. There's no way
to eternalize acquisitions. I won't even mention writing! But spoken languages
a very small number of thought associations. There are some precious and useful secrets,
discovered by fortune or ingenious personal observation, they are liable to be lost
irreparably lost in the night. No collective memory, no monument, no continuity.
continuity.

Either one becomes fixed, and the natural movement of the things of the earth, which are constantly
renewing themselves, does not stop to erase them.
methodically erase all traces of each effort. Or we wander from place to place,
and man's race adds its turbulence to the other causes of loss and oblivion.

Every attempt to pool solid capital is exposed to indefinite risks.
risks.

Tradition is not absent, because there is no society without tradition, nor men without society.
society: but it is at its lowest ebb. The individual could not subsist without it: because it is
miserable and weak, the weakness and misery of individuals are obvious; yet, in the presence
such a meagre inheritance, the newcomer can consider himself, without having too much to blush
of the little he brings compared to what he receives. If he owes the company a great deal, it would be
to make it his debtor.

But, on the contrary, the civilized person, because he is civilized, owes far more to society than society
could possibly owe him.
obligations to society than society could ever have to him. In other words, he has far more duties than
rights.
rights.

And when I speak of the civilized, I'm not referring to one of those favorites of nature and history
born French, or Italian, or Spanish, or even Anglo Saxon, enjoy the most brilliant
most brilliant, happy and marvellous processes of the human race.

I'm not even referring to a member of one of those small, secondary nationalities who participate,
by their position in space or time, to our vast general developments.

Beyond even the various clienteles of our Western civilization, the extent and immensity
of accumulated capital, the influence of ours creates reserves that are too numerous, too powerful,
too well transmitted, and too dazzling for it not to be utterly ridiculous to contrast or compare the frail
to compare it to the frail image of a newborn baby barely distinguishable from its mother. In such cases
that the individual is overwhelmed by the sum of goods that do not belong to him, and from which
yet enjoy to a greater or lesser extent. Rich or poor, noble or commoner
he bathes in an atmosphere that is not of raw nature, but of human nature,
which he did not create, and which is the great work of his innumerable direct and lateral predecessors.
predecessors, or rather of their fruitful association and their useful and just community.

No, let's not compare incomparables. Let's take less advanced civilizations,
still unfinished and barbaric, where the chorus of ideas, feelings and works is merely
stammer their ancient words: the heroic ages, tribes in the early days of their migration
migration, or cities in the first days of their building, or the sea in the days of its first sailors
the sea in the days of its first sailors, the fields in the first days of their clearing. What disproportionate
capital
the simple curved ploughshare of a plow, the canvas of a sail, the size of a wedge of rock
the yoke of a cart, the obedience of a racing or draught animal! What observations,

What observations, what trial and error, the slightest precise data on the seasons, the course of the stars the rhythm and fall of the winds, the relationships and balances! Not only can no single man can compare his knowledge with the general knowledge expressed here, but never can a single a single generation, adding up its efforts, would ever achieve anything like this. From an individual point of view, if this point of view were admissible to a human intelligence and reason, neither a spade nor an oar could be seen without reverence: the two poor tools pass what a solitary imagination can conceive, let alone what a personal art can achieve. can achieve.

As spades and oars have multiplied and diversified, as the instruments of industry instruments of industry, and that industry itself, have continued to grow and refine civilizations increase and perfect their resources and our treasures. The little savage was fed by his mother and trained by his father in certain indispensable exercises. There was nothing durable around him, nothing organized. What he had in the way of clothing, he gathered or borrowed with his own hands. he borrowed with his own hands from trees and grasses.

So was everything else. But around civilized man, everything abounds. He finds buildings that are older that will outlive him. An order is prepared in advance to receive him, and to meet the needs inscribed either in his flesh or in his soul. Just as physical instruments are appropriate to the delicacy of things, there are disciplines, sciences and methods that enable him to illuminate his image of the world and conduct himself. I not examine whether he is more fortunate or unfortunate, for this is a question quite distinct from

that which arises here; I am simply forced to note that he has, much more than a savage, the figure and attitude of a debtor.

His debt to society is roughly proportional to the intensity of his life. relatively little; but if he takes advantage of the many conveniences that his contemporaries their ancestors and his own have accumulated in his service, well, his debt increases in the same large proportion. But, in either case, he has no hope of settling it. hope of settling it: whatever services an individual renders to the community, he may be revered venerated by his successors, i.e. ranked among the common benefactors of the race, but, at the present time, he will never pay back his predecessors. Invent the differential calculus or the rabies vaccine, be Claude Bernard, Copernicus or Marco Polo. Polo, you'll never pay what you owe to the first ploughman or to the man who first sailed the the first nave. All the more reason why the first person to come along - or, as we say, the Individual - should be called the most insolvent of all. be called the most insolvent of beings.

But, of all these individuals, the most insolvent is undoubtedly the one who belongs to the richest civilization. If there is such a civilization, its members, debtors par excellence
debtors par excellence can all be defined by this character.

We should, I think, protest against a common mistake in language. We say civilization
civilization and civilizations. No, it's not the same thing at all. There
In China, there is civilization: in other words, a material and moral capital that is passed on. China has industries, arts, sciences and mores. There are riches, monuments, doctrines
doctrines, opinions and acquired qualities that are conducive to human life. Same
phenomenon in the Indies, Peru and, in some respects, in the depths of Africa, where powerful kingdoms
powerful kingdoms were founded, and in the islands of Oceania. What's exceptional on this planet is perhaps not a certain degree of civilization, but rather a certain savagery.
savagery. Man is instinctively conservative, accumulative, capitalist and traditionalist.
However developed these various civilizations may be, they are not, strictly speaking, Civilization.
civilization.

Civilization can only be defined by history. There was a moment, in the splendor of the world
world, when man, more inventive and industrious than he had ever been before, nevertheless that so much art was being exhausted in vain. What was the point of increasing the number of goods and the
the quantity of wealth? Any quantity is susceptible to new increases, any number to an indefinite
indefinite increase. The marvellous, the sublime, the grandiose or the enormous,
anything that depends on the quantity or number of elements used, cannot promise mankind
only disappointment. A tower or column of one hundred feet can be raised by another
which, in turn, can be multiplied in the same way. So what is this
this all-material progress? Neither in science, nor in art, nor even in the simple comforts of life
of life, this heap of things is nothing. The more it swells, the more it excites our desires, making us despair.

A poet, a poor poet who came late to an age of decadence and witnessed the decline of
civilization, Baudelaire, did a good job of defining the insatiable nature of a desire that tries to satisfy itself by the number of its pleasures.
by the sheer number of its pleasures

Enjoyment adds strength to desire.

Desire, an old tree to which pleasure serves as fertilizer,

While your bark hardens and grows,

Your branches want to see the sun closer
Will you still grow, great tree more perennial
Than the cypress?

The verses are rather mediocre. The sentiment is true, the idea profound. Yes, desire will always grow and, with it, pain, disappointment and anxiety. Civilizations, in imposing their debt civilizations, however, promise only an absurd and endless race until man the feeling of "the infinite vanity of everything", as the unfortunate Leopardi put it.

But when the Greeks sensed the vanity of research, they didn't want to admit that it was infinite. infinite. They sought an end to the perpetual race. A marvellous instinct, much more than reflection, or rather, if you like, a flash of superhuman or divine reason made them them that the good was not in the things, but in the order of things, was not in the number number, but in composition, and was not in quantity, but in quality. They introduced the strong notion of limits, not only into art, but into thought, into the science of morals. In morality, in science, in art, they felt that the essential was not the material. and, while employing the most precious materials, they applied their measure to them. The idea of the "point of perfection and maturity" dominated this great people for as long as they remained true to themselves.
faithful to themselves.

King Solomon believed he was doing science when he listed plants from the most to the highest: a Greek, Aristotle, taught us that this catalog of knowledge is only a starting point, that there can be no true science without order, and that the order of science is neither that of greatness nor that of smallness. Likewise, the artists of Egypt and Asia Asia sent samples of their skills to Greece; developing in this land and in this favoured race and in this favored race, Oriental models testified that art does not consist in making that art does not consist in making colossi, nor in distorting nature into monstrous grimaces, nor in copying it as closely as possible.
Greek art invented beauty. And
similarly, in self-government, the moralists taught that happiness does not lie that happiness does not come from the infinite number of elements we appropriate, nor from the stingy dryness of a soul
of a soul that withdraws and wants to isolate itself.
but it's also important that it knows how to find its own good, and to gather it by rising to it with a happy effort. The
Greek philosophy approached virtue in this way.

In its heyday, this quality civilization was called Greece. It became Rome scattered it across the universe, first with the legions of its soldiers and colonists, then with the missionaries of the Christian faith. In this way, the two Romes conquered the known world, and through the Renaissance, they found and completed themselves. when the Reformation interrupted their magnificent development.

Historians and dispassionate philosophers are beginning to assess exactly how far civilization

Civilization must henceforth express the name of the Reformation. In France, we owe
profound deeds of grace to the good sense of our kings and our people who, with a common effort,
repelled this deceptive liberation. It was their resistance that led to the development
of our nationality in the 16th, 17th and even 18th centuries: so complete, so brilliant,
so perfectly human that France became the legitimate heir to the Greek and Roman world.
Roman world. Through it, measure, reason and taste have reigned in the West.
barbaric civilizations, true Civilization has continued right up to the threshold of the contemporary age.
age.

In spite of the Revolution, which is nothing more than the work of the
Romanticism, which is merely a literary, philosophical and moral continuation of the
of the Revolution, it can still be argued that civilization in France is showing quite
our tradition has not been interrupted, our capital remains. It's up to us to
to make it flourish and bear fruit again.

A newborn child, according to Le Play, is a little barbarian. But when born in France, this little
barbarian
barbarian is called upon to receive through education a delicate extract of all the works of the Species.
His natural initiation makes him, in the full sense of the word, a man of quality.
quality.

Some of our neighbors and rivals have their doubts... Germans are barbarians, and the best of them know
it.
and the best of them know it. I'm not talking about Muscovites or Tartars. The human race
France is our France, not only for us, but for all mankind. The duties
can measure our obligations to her.

From the state of savagery to the state of barbaric civilization, from the state of civilized barbarism to the
state of full
I have endeavored to establish a series of clear definitions. I do not
I do not claim to deduce a moral code, nor the rules of justice. A strong government can, however
principles of intellectual and civil leadership.

Progress

We must not believe in the general progress of the world. There is progress.

There has been, and there can be, immense progress. There is no steady advance, no automatic,
increasing
of human values in the human race. Historical man (for
we hardly know what prehistoric man is) is the same everywhere, or very nearly so.

is. One point was gained, just one, in the Middle Ages, by the predominance of a spiritual power recognized by the entire Christian republic.
recognized by the entire Christian Republic, the unity of this single power.

Take away this living imitation, and how do you expect the rivalries of passions and interests of passions and interests, multiplied by the profound unintelligence or misintelligence of ideas, prejudices, beliefs and languages?
beliefs and languages?

The world's train is not a regular upward curve, nor indeed a downward one.
it's a broken line, with ups and downs.

It's a broken line, with ups and downs. Our thinking has accelerated by half as much as the speed of our trains.
joy of life, if it has increased, has not matched the growing variety of distractions and temptations and temptations.

Beneath the universal change that deludes and intoxicates us lies some great and profound law of immobility, or at least of compensatory equivalence in the oscillation of various changes...

... Can anything disrupt the mysterious equilibrium, without which man's fortune and pleasure would already be going to heaven?

The desire and hope of human progress, that is, of a continuity of collective gains, preserved from age to age, the sum of which would always outweigh the sum of the pearls, seem to me to be

excellent sentiments that should be cultivated and monitored,
in young souls.

But there's no guarantee that this desire and hope will be borne out in reality. In other words other words, I see no way of establishing soundly as a principle of natural philosophy, that human progress is fatal, nor that, for the last two thousand five hundred years the year of the completion of the Parthenon, if you like, mankind as a body, or, if you prefer, Western humanity has made any appreciable progress. It has been said that the most obvious sign of progress is
a growing respect for light living forms. I don't think we can consider progress to be the respect the respect of the axe for the homicidal criminal.

What does the idea of progress entail?

... The persuasion that the arts, sciences and all human endeavors are always moving in the same direction is one of the most dangerous of all.
is one of the most flourishing of our received ideas. It is by this persuasion that we judge, that we induce and deduce... Entire systems of artistic and moral history are based on it.

It's by virtue of this idea that we're determined to establish that our ancestors of the Middle Ages, excellent architects, must have been good poets, even though they were rather mediocre at poetry. The same idea is used to impose a barbaric art, language and taste on old Homer.
the jewellers, potters and statuaries of his day were still immersed in this barbarism, even though barbarism, although it would be unfair to compare Homer's divine grace with the stammering of Mycenaean art.

This false idea of Progress, as it is posited in literate minds (it has a more summary expression expression in the ignorant), is the result of a double operation of anthropomorphism.
of anthropomorphism.

1° Each era is imagined as a single being, whose parts are interdependent organs which develop simultaneously and concordantly;

2° Successive times are conceived as a succession of continuous regular increases of the same person...

These two gratuitous conjunctures have also been of great service to philosophers who knew how to handle them. Let's pretend for a moment to adopt both. They are not to justify the idea of progress as it is formulated today, for there are a few other things that remain to be proven.
a few other things.

If humanity forms a single being, and if each of its phases forms a living system and a well linked whole, there is nothing to prove, firstly, that this being does not belong to another kingdom of nature
in which the three-term curve (birth, development and decay) is replaced by some by some other rhythm, either simpler or more complex, such as the alternation of waking of wakefulness and sleep, as observed in some infusoria, or any regime of succession and of movement you can imagine.

If we sacrifice this first difficulty and admit that the law of humanity is the one followed by higher animals, there is nothing to prove that this is not the case.
secondly, nothing proves that our species has not passed the fixed point of the fixed point of maturity and that, this season of perfection, apogee and plenitude having having once been reached, we are now in decline.

To strengthen the idea of progress, we would have to add this third conjecture, which is at least as gratuitous as the others.
at least as gratuitous as the others:

3° This great Being whose unity we discern in each epoch and in the succession of epochs is below maturity and still growing.

I'm well aware that we can avoid this postulate by resorting to the following one

3° bis. It is a great Being of a particular kind, which has the power to grow indefinitely.
indefinitely.

This seems a very convenient option. But note that by adopting it, we abruptly change our method.
method: after lending humanity the first two phases of each of our lives,
birth and organization, we deny him the third and, abruptly dropping this
anthropomorphism or zoomorphism, we imagine it as a God. We absolve it of
degeneracy, free it from ageing, free it from death, give it inexhaustible strength
the prospect of perpetual movement, of limitless perfection...
limits... This is a remarkable lack of follow-through in a calculation that would require the greatest luxury of logical rigor and vigilance.
of logical rigor and critical vigilance.

It's true that this act of incoherence is fruitful.

By denying the possibility of decadence, we disarm all criticism in advance. Nothing authorizes this
for this act of faith in the indefinite progress of the human race, an unverifiable assertion.
contradicts it.

Alleging obvious losses or deficits and manifest regressions would only serve to elicit
a specious distinction between appearances and reality. To say that our globe or the sun
which illuminates it, will diminish and ultimately ruin the conditions of human life.
that human ingenuity will make up for the shortcomings of stingy nature.
that human ingenuity will make up for the shortcomings of stingy nature: the earth and nearby suns will supply us with the caloric we need, and our nephews, masters of the heavens, will provide us with the energy we need.
nephews, masters of the heavens, will be free to exchange this mediocre dwelling
for a more beautiful star, when it becomes uninhabitable. All they'll need is the ability to overcome
a little cosmographic chauvinism.

I repeat that a rigorous faith, ingenious and not very delicate in matters of proof, will always defend the old dogma of Progress.
the old dogma of Progress, formulated in these terms, against all the assaults of examining minds.
examining minds. But this faith is mystical, not "scientific", although it has often
the latter title. This faith is acquired, as I have explained, by a change of method
method, which is a logical error: it is maintained by imagination and feeling.

Perhaps, then, it would be appropriate for progressives to show less arrogance and pride towards religious faith.
arrogance and pride towards the religious faith of the simplest souls.
any degree or in any respect from the faith of the coalman when it rests on the postulate I have said.

Will they leave the postulate of unlimited growth and accept the conjecture that the human race is a young organism, barely born?
human race is a young organism barely out of infancy? This is more logical, but
but not more certain. It is all very well to concede to common sense that our human race,
conceived as a living being, is condemned one day to perish like the fruit when it has ripened.
that the flower is barely complete, that the bud has only just blossomed, is less certain.

71

However, the opinion, which remains unverifiable, would have some value and merit consideration if it were rooted in the thinking of most men. We could see in it
rm a sign of greenness and novelty, and an indication of the world's secret youth, analogous to that bubbling
to the bubbling of green sap under the still bare, blackish bark to which the breaths of the first spring reach.
of the first spring. Here, the feeling, well established everywhere, would make serious sense.

Why is it that this feeling is almost impossible to find? It's old age that all men complain about
all men, however young they may be, and however new their groups in history may be;
adolescence, with its turmoil, its heat and its diffuse hopes, does not show itself either in their acts nor in their speeches. Everywhere, even among us, when we speak instinctively and follow nature
nature, it's the Ancients that we invoke, it's from the Past that we draw our glory or our wealth,
it's in Experience that both the learned and the ignorant take refuge and entrench themselves in the event of difficulties.
difficulties.

If we listen to the heart of humanity, it seems to remember only the Golden Age or the first Paradise. This feeling of melancholy regret is general; what is very uncommon, on the contrary, is exceptional, peculiar.
on the contrary, what is exceptional, peculiar *to a people, to a caste, in a very limited moment
of their history, for example the French of the Revolution and Empire, contemporary Anglo-Saxons
American pork merchants around 1868, to some of today's electricians
of today, it's this strong faith, bordering on intoxication, in the future of their race or profession
in the progress of the kind of civilization that their rank represents or that their efforts create.
Still, it's not enough, and it lets us see the artificial, bookish and scholastic origin of its clouds and smoke.

smoke.

Why not leave its name to hope? Why the righteous pride of conquered
and celestial spaces, of nature mastered and humanized, want to forcefully express a dogma
dogma that nothing authorizes?

Part Four
Political science

Politics first

When we say "politics first", we mean politics first, first in the order of time, not in the order of dignity.

in the order of time, not in the order of dignity. We might as well say that the road must be taken
before arriving at its terminus; the arrow and bow will be seized before hitting the target;
the means of action will precede the center of destination.

From biology to politics

In the last century, ideas stemming from the natural and life sciences first played an important historical role.
an exciting and liberating role that is far from over.

Many minds, encountering on the one hand certain aphorisms of current politics, and, finding them
in direct opposition to the principles that govern all the rest of nature, have been led to examine
to examine these aphorisms: is nature constituted on one principle and human
and human society on an opposite principle? or are the two principles the same? or, without being
without being the same and without being contrary, are these principles not at once analogous and different?
different? This is the problem that biology has made a powerful contribution to posing, and posing it well.
However much it has subsequently given rise to confusion, and led to simple analogies - often remote - being taken for identities,
often remote, to be mistaken for identities, that may be [, but the primitive services are no less unforgettable.
unforgettable.

Some were temporary, others permanent. Biological ideas acted by suggestion
political science to grasp, by its own means, the essence of political heredity.
political heredity, political selection and political continuity. They have also made, and will continue to

make
they will provide material contributions, which it is obviously impossible to overlook: for,
however distinct political heredity may be from biological heredity, there are many connections
between the two orders of fact.
between the two orders of fact derive from the fact that the social being, man, is also a living being,
and subject to the laws of life.

Political science is autonomous: this does not mean that it is without communication with other
sciences.
other sciences. Sociology is distinct from biology: this does not mean that they are
two unrelated strangers.

A society may strive for equality, but in biology, equality is only to be found in the cemetery.

The more a being lives and perfects itself, the more the division of labor leads to inequality of functions,
which leads to the differentiation of organs and their inequality, even the inequality of their elements.
elements, whatever original identity these primitive elements may have: equality can be
be at the bottom of the ladder, at the start of life, it is destroyed by the progress of that same life.
Progress is aristocratic.

This certainly doesn't prove (yet) that our social progress must be achieved in the same way as animal
progress, at the expense of the human race.
the same way as animal progress, at the expense of individual equality; it does not (yet) prove
that the functions and organs of the state should be unequal. However, it does introduce
minds with clear notions of nature's constant movements, the feeling that her steps are not
that these steps are not at all those proposed by revolutionary dogma.
revolutionary dogma. These reflective minds are thus led to hesitate between two conjectures:
Perhaps there exists in universal nature a human kingdom, established as an empire within an empire.
an empire, and whose general regulations, differing from all other natural laws
is completely opposed to them, and involves their absolute overthrow.
unlikely hypothesis offends all the ideas of the time, perhaps this revolutionary
revolutionary view false, and the status of the human race must also include a large part for the laws of
authority and hierarchy.
the laws of authority and hierarchy that are the visible providence of other beings.

As dangerous as the biological method would have been if it had been used as evidence,
it offers as a stimulus to reflection and an instrument of discovery, since the social ideas
social ideas discovered in this way can be verified and demonstrated in other ways.

Let's not be afraid of giving analogy too much credit in this respect. It is the queen of investigation
for all disciplines of knowledge. Whatever the difference between the intestine, liver and brain

brain in man and in the various mammals, no one hesitates to institute between these organs and comparisons that benefit knowledge. How can the
which are valid for all degrees of being, from the bathybius to the chimpanzee
chimpanzee, make no sense for mankind! This would be tantamount to saying that the rock, the plant, the beast are heavy beings, but that the human being has nothing to do with scales and weights.
and weights. The unity of the plan of life would be absolutely interrupted in every respect at the threshold of human society.
of human society.

Even admitting that we are placed outside the animal series, kneaded and shaped
from a different silt than all living things, is it morally possible for us not to have any kind of affinity
affinity with this nature that envelops and presses us? The banal precautions that
prevent the universality of animate races from dying would not play the slightest part in safeguarding our life.
our lives. If the "sublime animals", so dear to the Romantic poet, are capable of
models of moral stoicism, it would at least be reasonable not to reject their lessons in
their lessons in perseverance, material resistance, physical prosperity and longevity.
prosperity and longevity. This, moreover, is the spontaneous reflex of the human spirit.
wisdom of the nations has never shied away from it; its fables and sayings have often emphasized the
of limbs and stomach, of kings and nations. Human languages commonly identify
body and people, heads and chiefs. Pure presumption? Perhaps.

The immense general ratification provided by the natural sciences is similarly nothing more than presumption.
presumption. But this presumption is corroborated. For as soon as we approach the direct study..,
the history of phenomena peculiar to man, the aristocratic and monarchical doctrine
is demonstrated in its own place and in its own way. Comte and Fustel can confirm Taine and Bourget,
the specific laws that protect man in society from death are not those of bees and ants.
and ants, but they are of the same order, of the same family, and they agree in rejecting any
system of democracy in the causalities of evil and death.

From then on, all the presumptions that had heralded the direct proof, or made it presage it,
envelop it in the gentle radiance of persuasive evidence, which is to truth, contemplated face to face
face to face, what the flattering play of phosphorescence is to rectilinear arrows, to blows of light.

of pure light. This one does its work, the rest takes the place of the most useful of ornaments.
ornaments.

Laws

According to Comte, politics, the daughter of biology, encloses, like any other science, precise laws that are prior and superior to the wills of men.
and superior to the wills of men: it is in relation to these natural laws that
that legislation must be judged.

A just political law is not a law that has been regularly passed, but a law that is consistent with its object and appropriate to the circumstances.
circumstances. We don't create it, we uncover it and discover it in the secret
of places, times and states.

Political formulas are not waffle irons, and if the laws of nations, like the laws of the world and of man of the world and of man, are immutable, we must realize that all the situations of history and geography are original.
geography are original.

There is something unique about them that must be treated as such.

These are not laws of becoming, laws of the movement of societies, laws of their dynamism.
dynamism, but rather laws of their state.

It is not a question of determining the law (hitherto unapprehended) according to which the evolution of the human race has taken place or would have taken place.
the evolution of the human race or of the civilized West, a law which, if it were known,
a general deduction about the future

No: it's a question of the laws according to which certain facts occur, and which usually don't arise separately.
arise separately.

Laws comparable to those which nature and the laboratory follow every day. They
consist of constant connections, and such that, given the antecedent, we can be sure of seeing the consequent appear.
the consequent appear. For example, the raising of water to a hundred degrees and the phenomenon of boiling.
boiling. For example, the advent of democratic elections and the phenomenon of
centralization. You can stop water from heating up to a hundred degrees, where it boils: you can't stop it from boiling there.
prevent it from boiling there. You can stop elective democracy from happening: if it does, you can't stop it from happening.
you can't stop it from centralizing.

As much as the search for the laws governing the future of societies seems to have yielded results so far results, the pursuit of regular constants and static laws is proving certain and fruitful.
laws is proving certain and fruitful. What is said about their complexity is nothing more than a
lazy sophistry. What is not complex? What well-studied complexity doesn't
doesn't sooner or later become simple? What we add to exclude political knowledge from the truth

truth in order to reduce it to a vague verisimilitude comes from poor minds too interested in not knowing.
not to know.

For if it's true that political experience, in the strict sense of the word, is pure historical observation experimentation proper, that is to say, and this goes without saying, to the experiment experience, it is true that this broad, clear experience of the past sheds a ray of light on the political theorist a ray of light whose equivalence the chemist does not know, and which the the physicist must assume and calculate. The political theorist observes the sequence and chain of facts. But, on the other hand, what he knows of man also enables him to grasp what generates

these events: the inner play of human passions, ideas and interests is shown to him pure and naked, so that his observation doesn't stop at signs and phenomena, but rather it grasps the reasons for being, the generators. From then on, the historian is not content to simply see and show
that the effect of electoral democracy is to centralize, he tells us why this chain is constant.
constant. His observation is also an explanation: the power born of voting is obliged, if it is not to perish not perish, to secure the voters; nothing being more to be feared for this power than the liberties of these voters, it is automatically induced to confiscate them one by one. This psychology would be sensitive to reason. But it is also attested, motives and motives, by the speeches and by the speeches and writings of contemporaries of the observed event. It's impossible to tell the story without making
without hinting at what goes on in the minds and hearts of those who produced it.

In the laboratory of universal history, man finds himself both subject and object of the experiment. But this paradoxical situation is perhaps what gives the conclusions of political history a value that does not belong to those of the chemist. The chemist is reduced to conjecture the historian, and the politician knows, from within, like the most secret atoms like the most secret atoms of the spiritual cause of the reactions he witnesses.
he witnesses.

So be it! But how can this knowledge benefit us?

Well, if we possessed the law of the world's evolution and the future's governing curve, it would be easy for us to say with absolute certainty: "What's in it for me?
it would be easy for us to say: at such and such a date, in such and such a circumstance, such and such an event will occur.

We don't have this Law, but we do have laws, constants, and these allow us to say: if this happens, that happens.
to say: if this happens, that will happen. A given cause will produce a given effect: this black spot on the

horizon
heralds such and such a storm. If the Number of Votes governs, Money will govern after it;
if democracy is born, plutocracy will follow. Where democracy is born, centralization
centralization, etc.

Let's retrace our steps. If politics can be the object of science, then primitive institutions
institutions are not born of personal acts like wills, but of a convention, a contract
between independent entities, masters of their own fate. The postulate of
science is that societies are facts of nature and necessity. But right from the
of this young science, the postulate has been verified. No trace of the primitive contract
nor of the solitary primitive. All human society appeared to be contemporary
of man. Law, civil and political law itself, appeared as a relationship deriving from the nature of things
of things, in accordance with Montesquieu's definition, and contrary to the
democratic definition of the Declaration: "The law is the expression of the general will. Relationship of
relationship of convenience or necessity, the law escapes arbitrariness.
but is the result of examining situations that do not depend on this "Freedom".

This was the first word coined by political science in its infancy.

The second word it wrote was no less important, for it was the word "organization".

When the French have become worthy of understanding the scope and depth of the language
they have inherited from their fathers, they will no longer say "organization", they will go back to the
proper word and say "order".
and say ordre. Instead of organize, the verbs order or put in order will prevail.

A third word of infinite importance is uttered by political science. It teaches
that the societies it examines are not made up of individuals, but of families.

The individual is not a social unit. The family alone is such a unit. Societies are not
societies are not made for a human age: they develop beyond it. To what extent? We don't
know...

But there can be no doubt of the existence of this broad life that envelops and sustains us.
In practice, companies may be immortal. I don't see why the strongest
last as long as the human race. In any case, to conceive of them
conceive them historically.

A fourth point is established in political science: the criterion of societies. What is it?
A prosperous life. Le Play invokes examples of prosperous societies at every turn.

This empirical criterion, based on the state of contemporary France and Europe
that democratic and revolutionary principles have been judged and condemned
by Renan, Taine, Balzac, Bonald, Burke, Macaulay and others.

Politics is thus defined as the science and conditions of prosperous community
life.
communities. A lethal principle, or one that leads to a decline in general health and prosperity
is automatically disavowed by this science.

Organizing empiricism

Ever since the age when we thought we could think, I've never imagined that theories gave rise to
institutions.
institutions. But, it's true, I can't deny the power of a just doctrine in a man's mind.
in the mind of a statesman, as I've never been one for historical fatalism. If you like
if you like, I had "theories", and if you like, I still have them: but, from time immemorial, these theories
have
deserved their name, which shows their prudence and humility.
Empiricism, i.e. the use of past happiness to build the future that every well-born
wishes for his country.

The examination of natural social facts and the analysis of political history lead to a number of certain
truths.
past establishes them, psychology explains them, and the subsequent course of contemporary
course of contemporary events confirms and acknowledges them.
and seriousness, it doesn't take much skill to apply these ideas correctly,
drawn from experience, and which new facts derived from later experience are most likely to verify.
have the greatest chance of verifying.

In this case, deduction is the natural consequence of well-made inductions. The critical sense awakened
in the first part of the operation does not extinguish its torch during the mysteries of the second part
as it is called upon at both the start and the finish of the process.

We're not metaphysicians. We know that needs can change. There may
be a time when men feel the need to guarantee themselves against arbitrariness by means of
numbered articles of law. There are other times when the impersonal authority of written law
seems to them a profound deception.

In the first case, they demand constitutions.

In the second case, statutes seem to matter less and less.
the living responsibility of individuals and their actions.

The method that has always seemed to me to be the most in tune with the laws of life has never given a general discharge to a "block" of companies.
of what the Fathers did. By giving people pious respect
the critical mind reserves the right to examine works and ideas.

But the critical spirit sees clearly: the revolutionary spirit neither knows nor wants to look: From the past
Let's wipe the slate clean, says its song. I hate this program of amnesia.

No, no clean slate. However, free rein!

History

Our mistress in politics is experience.

Experience is like the Muse, the daughter of Memory.

History is not a cabinet test: however, its undeniable repetition, in circumstances
circumstances, allow us to draw up, with satisfactory rigor, tables of presence
tables of presence, absence and variation that are comparable to those that
the study of nature. It's all very well to insist on absolute originality,
the absolute originality and uniqueness of historical phenomena. They are original, they are unique,
but their sequence is not.

Bainville admired the picture of the world's monotonous "sequels" and the stable virtues of the human compound.
human compound. The comings and goings of history bear such constants that, properly conducted,
it allows us to make predictions without suffering from deviations.

The experience of history contains the science and art of this kind of discovery.
development, the result has been and is increasingly favorable to the ideas of counter-revolution
to the ideas of counter-revolution, anti-liberalism and anti-democracy. The experience of
history is full of the mass graves of freedom and the cemeteries of equality.

The human constant taught by history

The art of looking after people's security is akin to the guiding principles of all the elementary arts.
the first truth that a philosopher or magistrate must grasp is that the world changes
the world changes extremely slowly, if at all. The variable parts
are the least important. What matters appears constant. It is on the broad general
of human constancy that we urgently need to regulate ourselves whenever we
future arrangements.

By dint of showing us masses that evolve and aspects that transform, we hide the workers of evolution.

the workers of evolution and the artisans of transformation. Without leaders, without saints
saints, heroes and kings, history is unintelligible. A nation is made up of nations,
a race of races, a state of states. Whether we're talking about feudalism, commies or the Church, real life

is not in the successive, accidental and ephemeral members, but in the invisible links
but in the invisible links that give the whole something to imitate. It is of this, and nothing else, that the history
history must be written: the history of France, not the history of the French.

78

Universal history in its detail is impossible. The overall law that would simplify and condense it
and condense it into a great and powerful lesson, this general law does not seem to me to have been discovered.
The useful historian knows how to isolate a fact, circumscribe an action, describe a character: the fact, the action,
The fact, the action, the character that can enable us to grasp the how of human things. The field of
our experience, and we are better able to understand and interpret present and
and interpret present and future events.

Although the cases, the facts are infinite in number, if however you know in some detail and in
how Chicago, Athens and Quimper Corentin developed,
you'll have the chance to see for yourself the pattern followed by most other cities
other cities and states. Of course, you can always expect a surprise: nature and history are full of surprises.
nature and history are full of traps set for mortal fatuity. But this truth is
in the history of Athens, Quimper and Chicago...

If, to make a fable, you take a pinch of sand in your hand and listen to the confused murmur
the confused murmur of innumerable atoms, you'll see, if you're wise, that out of a hundred voices,
ninety-nine say: trust. The hundredth says: beware, and the double advice
nothing is done without criticism, nothing without faith.

The company

Living conditions in society

It is true that a very small number of exceptionally distinguished and powerful individuals
transform a society: they do so only by transforming institutions or religion, but it is never
They do so only by transforming institutions or religion, but never by modifying, one by one, every
head of the infinite herd of individuals.

The "individual" as such, abstract, the individual considered as an indifferent unit, can be Peter or Paul

too.
be Peter or Paul equally, the individual appears to compose society:
he is made and unmade by it.

Acting individuals are not individuals. They are people. If we get it right
following the rules of a delicate and profound art, taking advantage of the hour, benefiting from situations
situations, placed in a word on the most propitious points, knowing how to play the jimctnra rerum, the points of conjunction of things, these elite people modify and reform the social and reform the social environment, and only then can the "individual" make corresponding progress, slowly acquired and incorporated from age to age.

The equality myth

Equality cannot reign anywhere; but its obsession, its desire, establishes a political spirit directly contrary to a country's vital needs: the democratic spirit kills military discipline and the people need an army; the democratic spirit, through the envy it distills, kills civil concord civil concord, cordiality and peace between individuals, and the people need concord, peace and cordiality,
cordiality.

In a powerful, vast, rich and complex state like ours, everyone must have as many rights as possible. as many rights as possible, but it depends on no one to make these rights equal
when they correspond to naturally unequal situations. So when, in such a case, the law
the law proclaims this equality, the law is lying, and, as everyday facts put this lie, the law is lying.

citizens the respect they owe to their country's political system, they receive a permanent
receive constant advice of anarchy and insurrection. '

Association: a fact of nature

What is association? Is there a "right" of association for the individual? Wouldn't it be
would it not be more accurate to say that there is a duty, an obligation and, let's speak better French, rme necessity of association in all cases where he can live?

Let's go a step further. Does the individual form society? Does he produce it? Where? Isn't it, on the contrary, society that forms the individual?
society that forms the individual? Isn't society its product everywhere?

Let's take another look at the world of living beings. There are species (they are very inferior) where the individual determines a kind of society; these are the species where reproduction takes place

by scissiparity. A being, whose parts seem homogeneous and almost identical,
splits in two, and there are two identical beings. This is not the case with higher animals;
Here, a couple is needed, two very different individuals to produce a third individual.
This new being is not born from a generator, or even from two generators, but more exactly from the society of these generators.
society of these generators. Association is something other than the addition of associates. And it begins by appearing to be their mother.

But, in the human race, on the one hand, the newborn is so weak, on the other, it is called to such degrees of development that society can't even begin to take shape.
development that society never leaves it. It receives him and continues him, it
and follows it; before and after chacrm of us, this great beneficent fairy
which has a few useful industries and traditions everywhere, but which, among our
Western races, centralizes rm immense civilizing capital, our human society (without being indebted debtor to the greatest geniuses who have always received from it far more than they have contributed to it)
seems to be the universal creditor of our fellow human beings. Truly, as Léon de Montesquiou remarked so well
in La Raison d'Etat, one cannot say: "1° Man; 2° Society. It
It is absolutely necessary to agree with the statement: "1°, La société; 2°, L'homme.

Associated man, at once grouped and isolated, regulated and liberated by association, is undoubtedly no better than individual man.
than individual man; he is simply better suited to a higher life, to life in society.
life, to the life of society. He dares less for his whim. He has more interest in daring for the common good
good, the community that presses him being small and the good of the community closer to his own.
closer to his own.

The age of association begins again. Unions, corps, communities and companies of all kinds
of all kinds will be to this twentieth century what cathedrals were to the twelfth. The collective mass has

become so strong that no individual will feel courage, life, security and therefore happiness
as long as he or she is strongly framed, supported and disciplined in a secondary
to which he can attach all the fibers of his flesh and all the springs of his soul.
of his soul.

And if you want to know what I really mean, I'll tell you that this has always been the case in all the times
times when man has lived normally. The general anarchy of the 19th century forged the best
rm revolutionary brain in which the natural notion of the human self is distorted.
The true self, the spontaneous self, is rm us, or has no meaning.

A man accustomed to thinking rigorously and counting everything he is other than
himself is terrified of the smallness and misery of his own strictly personal domain.

We are our ancestors, our masters, our elders. We are our books, our paintings, our statues
statues; we are our landscapes, we are our travels, we are (I end with the strangest and most
the strangest and most unknown), we are the infinite republic of our body, which borrows
almost everything it is from the outside and distills it in stills whose direction and
the direction and even the feeling of which escape us completely.

Society is certainly not a great animal of which individuals are only subordinate cells.
subordinate cells. But neither is it one of those "pooled" wills that, in law
called associations in law.

Society is not a voluntary association: it is a natural aggregate.

It is not willed, it is not elected by its members. We choose neither our blood, nor our country
nor our language, nor our tradition. Our native society is imposed on us. The
human society is part of our natural need. We only have the ability to accept it
to accept it, to rebel against it, perhaps to flee from it, without being able to do without it.
essentially.

For the realist mind, warned by history, if it is not distorted by a false history of Right,
the true guarantor of individual rights is first society, then association.

Have a solid society, and one in which the first social nucleus, the family, is strong: primordial rights
rights, whether religious, domestic or educational, will have their line of retreat and defence.
defense.

Have powerful associations, especially trade associations, and the other essential rights
will find their basis and foundation.

Have a well-constructed state, and these distinct, diverse and sometimes conflicting rights will not make
the city their battleground.
their battleground, because public order will also be provided with a flesh-and-blood guarantor, its
magistrate.
its interested and responsible magistrate. Apart from that, you'll have nothing but parties fighting
fighting, interests killing each other.

In a well-constructed society, the individual must accept the law of the species, not the species perish
from the will of the individual.
will of the individual.

Individualist legislation that considers only the individual, without taking into account the position
position he occupies in the world, his family, his class, his country, his work.

This legislation claims to safeguard the rights of each individual first and foremost. It enshrines
the maxim that such rights are infinitely respectable, and are to be hailed
and that we must salute them. But each individual, isolated in the name of the law, finds himself unable
to ensure the exercise of these famous rights. He is left defenseless to the few organizations
organizations that may have sprung up in defiance of the law.
powers of the State, who have the law on their side above all else.

From the point of view of individual happiness and defense, there is nothing more important than those
secondary and intermediate societies, those that guarantee the home, local life and the craft.
But for them to exist and resist, another power is needed.

It takes nothing to destroy. It takes years of effort, labor and patience to create. The
of a rhetorician is enough to ruin. Societies grow more slowly than humans.

the embryo, the infant and the child; their downfall is even faster than that of the living being
a bullet or a stab.

The state

The family is the foundation of the State, since on the one hand, the population exists only through the
family, and on the other hand, it is the family that distinguishes the State from the rest of the world.
on the other hand, it is the family that distinguishes political society from other societies: a society that is
not recruited by the will of its members, but normally by the will of its members.
will of its members, but normally by generation, a society where people are born and
reproduce. I am a member of the French State because of my father, my mother and their parents.
I can ratify or decline this condition, but I do not create it, and it creates me. Adoptive
adoptive children who join the large French family by other means do so only because there is a first
French state, a French family.
there is a first French State, a family of families, naturally engendered.

Any doctrine of the State as dispenser and distributor of rights will be dissolved by this simple
observation
that society, both spiritual and temporal, predates, both logically and historically
and historically, to the State.

State and society are distinct. Society begins with the family, its first unit.
It continues in the commrme, the professional and denominational association,' the infinite variety
variety of groups, bodies, companies and communities, without which all human life would wither.
would wither away. The State is merely an indispensable and primordial organ of society.

The State, whatever it may be, is the servant of Society.

The State, when properly instituted, has almost nothing to do with individuals. It is the societies mutual relations, that its principal attributes are exercised.
only criminals, along with heroes and saints - exceptional personalities - have any dealings with the with the State, which has the right to know about these anomalies, either to honor or to punish them. punish them. Let's add to the list of people in direct commerce with the State, the small number of including the army and navy. In all other respects, a normal state allows
under its sceptre and sword, the multitude of small spontaneous organizations,
autonomous collectivities, which were there before it and are likely to survive it, the true
immortal substance of the nation.

In these distinct spheres, endowed with privileges as varied as their functions
will develop, not the unobtainable "Individual" who does not blossom there every twenty-five years, nor every hundred years, nor ever.
hundred years, nor ever, but the human flora and fauna of different individuals, well nourished by preserved by the air of their class and country, and stimulated by the atmosphere
the atmosphere of the optional groups to which their honor, interest or pleasure has regularly regularly joined.

From the small-town "cercle" to the Institut de France, there's a whole range of groups. The individual finds
rights proportionate to his rank and service, his dignity and worth. Thus, the least
of our compatriots is privileged by destiny. Rich or poor, he or she is a patrician because he or she the noble status of Frenchman, and thus enjoys the powerful prerogatives and immense
the immense material and moral heritage made freely available to him by all that his forebears did. his ancestors.

From their immemorial work, nurtured and continued by tradition, flow all the virtues and individual values
virtues, all the individual values of which nature had only provided the germ: the will, freedom freedom, sentiment and reason to the degree that French society has been able to elevate them all. Flower of

French culture, the French individual is certainly neither its principle, nor its goal, nor its root, nor its fruit.
the fruit.

The memories, hatreds and loves that private individuals cannot sustain on a constant basis
a State takes them into its own hands, keeps a register of them, and updates this register in such a way as to exercise all rights, and to make the most of them.

in such a way as to exercise all the rights, support all the interests, pursue all the duties
are noted. In a normal state, public emotions are not mere blows of sensitivity
swept away, replaced at the first headwind: they become the matter and substance
substance of useful acts, they serve to recover and restore what may have been lost through the
communal,

Reason of State

The raison d'État is in the nature of things. But a state is only as good as its reason.

The reason of a State placed above all parties is inspired by the higher necessities of the nation's existence.
of the nation.

A state created by parties, tossed between parties, has no other reason than the one it can have:
it is short, limited, successive, contradictory. It covers particular interests instead of
general interests.

Distinctions between morality and politics

A reasonable political calculation cannot be based on the hope that the whole world will one day turn
will one day be turned around in the direction of goodness.

Politics is not morality. The science and art of statecraft is not the science and art
of human conduct. Where the general man may be satisfied, the particular state may be
discomfited.

The order of politics and the order of conscience are distinct. The human conscience pursues
spiritual ends, seeking individual salvation. Politics is concerned with the temporal,
is concerned with the prosperous life of communities; it determines the general conditions of public good
public good within the natural groups formed by mankind,
a set of natural laws. Given these laws, it sets out to define and formulate them
with all the clarity of science, it traces and enlightens the conduct of politics, in much the same way as physiology and pathology.
as physiology, pathology and therapeutics inspire and direct the conduct of physicians.
physicians.

Just as there were purely chemical or physical phenomena in the organization of a man like Descartes or St. Vincent, so there were purely physical phenomena in the organization of a man like Descartes or St. Vincent.
Descartes or Saint Vincent de Paul, every society is built according to natural necessities.
It's a question of knowing exactly what they are, not of asserting or disputing their justice and validity.
well-founded. We don't know if it's right that a son should not be able to choose his father, or that a citizen

to be thrown into a race before he has expressed his free will, his free choice. We know that
things can't be any other way. Is it right that a well-intentioned
well-intentioned opinion, when it is absurd, can lose a state? Perhaps, but for the salvation of the state
State, the important thing is not to decide whether the thing is right, but to know it so as to avoid it.
The infallible way to lead astray anyone who ventures into political activity is to evoke

the concept of pure morality, at a time when he must study the relationships between facts and their
combinations.
and their combinations.

Morality is superimposed on wills: yet society does not emerge from a contract of wills, but from a fact
of nature.
but from a fact of nature.

By examining structure, fit and historical and social connections, we can observe the nature of social
man (and, indeed, of mankind as a whole).
the nature of social man (not his will), the reality of things (not their justice).
we observe a set of facts that, after all, we can't say whether they are moral or immoral,
because they are essentially outside the category of right and duty, since they do not relate
our wills.

There is no direct relationship between moral perfection and the perfection of political forms.
political forms, the latter being linked to objects quite foreign to men's morality, such as the
the geographical or economic condition of their land.

Scipio imposes himself through gentleness; and it is morally very good to be gentle. Annibal imposes
himself
terror, and it's morally wrong to spread terror.
moral powers that terror here and gentleness there have acted. They acted in another sphere
sphere, as powers of feeling. A Cartesian would say that Annibal as well as
Scipio are much more in the mechanical order than in the moral order: it is by means of
that these two generals were powerful and happy:
the gentleness of one and the terror of the other corresponded to the situations they both
were aiming for. Reverse the situations, and give Annibal the peoples that Scipio tamed with his good
grace.
his good grace, he will unanimously arouse them against him and thus perhaps lose himself; give Scipio
Scipio the peoples that Annibal subjugated with rigor, and his gentleness may well
inspire nothing but rebellion. In other words, tenderness and harshness, gentleness and violence,
before being moral forces, are forces, and it is as forces that they act in politics, be they
happy or unhappy, depending on the degree, moment or place of application.
What does this mean? That goodness, and indeed malice, have no virtue of their own in the

order of military or political successes and setbacks: when an honest man wins, it's not is victorious, it is not honesty that is victorious, nor malice when it is the wicked man who wins. This area of political fortune is subject to particular and specific laws. laws.

Government

Organize

I take to organize in the primary sense

To organize oneself, to put one's thoughts first with one's thoughts, to know where one is going, on what vehicles and by what paths.
vehicles and by which paths.

To organize means to differentiate. To differentiate is the opposite of to equalize. A nation is made up of people
people who were born here and not there. It implies birth, heredity, history, the past. It constitutes a first objection to the Babelian dream of anarchy.

I've heard it said that to organize, you have to destroy. Yes, in the scheme of things once they've happened.
But to train minds, to induce them to carry out a project, the order is reversed.
organize before destroying, and if you want to succeed in destroying.

This is the meaning of the saying generally attributed, and I believe wrongly, to Danton: "You don't destroy what you replace.
what you replace. The word would be worthy of this civil servant of the ancien régime, one of the few political minds of the Revolution. To change what exists, you have to have something else in mind than the decree of a provisional government and an appeal to the people. Inconsistent never lead to action. At least in the imagination
man wants something solid and precise.

The vice of discussion

The art of dragging out discussion between those who know and those who don't is the most elementary of all arts.
of all the arts. We always practised it as children at school...

But... But... If...

All you need are three little words, repeated ten and twenty times. They answer everything, and they can
lead anywhere. Without doubt, knowledge is equipped to dispel one by one these doubts of bad faith
one by one, to put everything back on the right track or in the right light. But this tedious work
represents an enormous waste of time and energy, not to mention the fact that it necessarily
necessarily produces a shaking of confidence, a more or less clear-cut halt in the enthusiasm
of enthusiasm. Such is the natural work of criticism, whatever it may be,
when it is developed in assemblies or before large audiences. It only takes
seconds for destructive voice emissions, it takes hours and hours to patiently
to patiently reconstruct the particular truths best uncovered by technical expertise.
sometimes even the most robust truths of common sense only come back to light
slowly and painfully.

That's when it would be precious for a people to be able to "influence it". That's when
that moral authority would be precious, the kind that leads before convincing, the kind that
persuades before arguing. It saves us from the inertia and trampling that are the fatal causes
which, in political or military struggles, are the fatal causes of the last misfortunes.

This is why all the masters of political science, whether they belonged to the theological school
theological school, like Maistre and Bonald, or to the positivist school, like Comte and his disciples,
circumscribe discussion to the theoretical order, to the realm of elaboration, but proscribe it from action.

there is no Religion of discussion, no Morality of discussion, for as soon as we act morally and
morally and religiously, we no longer discuss, we decide, we risk. In such cases
for "certainty" after contradictory debate is to resign yourself to perishing. There is no
Government by discussion: to govern is still to entrust oneself, to risk. But this risk
of moral, religious or political action is the wisest risk par excellence.
nothing would be more imprudent or irrational than not to risk. For we risk even more by abstaining,
to discuss and deliberate, we risk the most serious and we risk the worst, since the enemy is in arms, if
we don't take action.
arms, if we don't arm against him before he does, the risk we run is that of falling
under his blows.

85

Generosity of power

Genuine friendship between people is not a sentimental phenomenon, but a basic and primitive fact of
life.
primitive order, linked to a quasi-physical order of needs. A powerful people
attaches itself to other peoples through the tangible signs of friendship, by sharing with them what it
has,
by letting them share in the useful and pleasant radiance of what they are.

To spread goodness around you, then, you must first of all be with fullness, and not have
and have made no compromises in terms of honour. Secondly, one must possess, take and hold,
if one wants to give, and this presupposes a firm use of strength, the yield of that strength, and judicious and generous
judicious and generous distribution of its product.

Refrain: you can only do good around you by first doing good within yourself. Work, act,
earn, produce: neither customers nor the poor will leave your doorstep with their fists out.
Lie like a beggar in the sun or the rain, in the inert dream of your destiny: this unproductive good
unproductive property will only arouse envy, jealousy and dangerous hatred.
perpetuate this spectacle of inaction and half-discomfort. It will show publicly that you can be of no help
of any help to anyone. If only to be generous, French people,
apply yourself to being strong.

The action

We compose, we compromise when we have other securities.

We maneuver around a firm, strong pivot.

But when everything has to be conquered in an environment where everything moves, transforms and is lost with unprecedented speed, it's time to take action.
unprecedented speed, there's only one method that can be recommended because it's the only strong one.
is to be oneself, fully, completely, to organize oneself powerfully, to attract to oneself
all the resources and means you can honestly hope for and, thus armed and equipped,
to walk, to run, as fast as possible, straight ahead, boldly, inflexibly :
everything that doesn't die, everything that doesn't dissolve, is destined, by the very law of nature
nature, sooner or later to join this steadily-growing nucleus, which is progressing towards a clear
to a well-defined goal, with a rectilinear and accelerated movement.

Knowledge and use of interest

In the vast majority of human beings, self-interest is the nerve of private action. We wouldn't
produce, we would not strive to vary the modes of production in such a way as to obtain
effort, if the spur of self-interest did not compel them to do so.
This interest may be selfish, or it may be collective. It can be exercised in the name of one man
it can act on behalf of a family or an association: it is always exercised under the same conditions
the same conditions, through the intermediary of a man's brain and heart committed to the
management of this interest, rewarded by success and chastened by setbacks, in a word strongly,
deeply, personally responsible.

With a strong State and powerful Associations, Mirabeau's dream could be realized, that dream
dream "where the legislator would be content to speak to individual interest, to provide it with the

means of exercising itself, and to direct it in the right direction".
and direct it invincibly towards the general interest, for the greater good of all springs.

political springs". In other words, according to Auguste Comte's wish, such a regime could "call upon personal impulses to the aid of social affections", granting tempted individuals the freedoms freedoms favorable to the public good.

"The general interest is the sum of individual interests". Counter this nonsense:
say that the general interest is a subtraction from particular interests, and you'll get closer to the truth. closer to the truth.

This subtraction is not made spontaneously, but by authority. Individuals consent to it when the operation is carried out, or when they are forced to allow it to be carried out. A very small number
are able to see the futility of the sacrifices made by individuals to the State; a still smaller number see the dangers of sacrifices made by the State to individuals.

I certainly don't believe that interest drives the world, but rather that it immobilizes and loses it, but it is obvious that the particular, particularistic atoms of which the masses of the world are composed of which the masses of the world are composed are easily led in the direction of their interests.

Disinterestedness does little in its pure state, except in a few heroes. Pure interest often guides very poorly. The true art of politics is to discern the point at which passion and duty passion and duty, private interest and national interest.

Money

Wealth is a good, and its concentration is a force.
and dissolves in the hands of the individual, who becomes its mere dupe, a dupe of material things, a dupe of the idea of profit when he can find it.
the idea of profit when he converts it into supposed personal satisfactions which, from the first to the last, can only deceive him.
to the last, can only deceive.

Whatever disguise it employs, Money is too pretentious, too vain, too ambitious to have it all. to have everything, for it to be possible to ignore it.

Worse still than that of the multitude and the Number, which, inert and absurd, may have human fibre, the government of Money is too pretentious, too vain, too ambitious to have it all.
the government of Money creates folly and crime.

Money renders beautiful services when, like other human forces, it takes its place as a great servant.
great servant. Beyond that, it can only destroy.

Sovereignty

Neither implicitly nor explicitly do we accept the principle of national sovereignty,
since it is, on the contrary, to this principle that we have opposed the principle of sovereignty
of public salvation, or the public good, or the general good.

We don't believe in the sovereignty of the people. We don't believe in it because it doesn't exist.
does not exist. When we proclaim it, it means that there is no longer any real sovereign, and that
sovereign functions are now exercised by anyone.
sovereign functions are now exercised by anyone, by the first person to come along, or by the last,
and, above all, by no one: affairs of state are left to chance or fall
in the midst of deficiency.

The great honor of acknowledging and atoning must be reserved for the type of government where
sovereignty is concentrated in a single blade.
sovereignty is concentrated in a single blade and in the living person of one man.

The democratic myriapod's life is too diffuse and his sense too obtuse to glimpse even the
principle of the great political obligations. He neither observes them nor violates them, and neither
than beasts, in fact, it sins.

Opinion

Where opinion rules, governmental spontaneity no longer has a center, an organ or a place.
Athenian, Polish, French, the State can only float like a cork,
or roll like a billiard ball. However, if independence and initiative are thus reduced
to nothing, it doesn't at all herald the end of movement and tribulation: on the contrary!
If we don't walk, we're made to walk.
made to walk.

It's not a question of knowing the opinion of nine-tenths of the French people on the conditions of
public salvation, but of knowing what the conditions are.
public salvation, but what are the real conditions of this salvation. Were we to know these conditions
38 million, we would be right to propose them, to support them, to plead for them
plead for them, to work to make them prevail over the opinion of others, by every means
present themselves.

When you take current opinion as your arbiter, you set it on the most terrible course.

Today it wants to live, tomorrow it wants to die. You won't change man's nature
but you will have destroyed the wise precautions that civilized societies have taken against these causes of death.
against these causes of death.

I write quite calmly that a Prince who believes himself to be the creature of opinion will not be able
the most difficult part of the royal function, which is to enlighten and direct opinion instead of following it.
instead of following it, that is to say, sometimes contradicting it when public salvation so requires. At the end of the
eighteenth century, on the eve of the Revolution, nothing matched Austria's unpopularity in
French circles who believed themselves to be "well-informed". All subsequent history, however, establishes
that the Monarchy and its ministers, and their system of reversing alliances, were right
against the most powerful and widespread opinion.

It is important for the Prince to know and feel that he does not depend on opinion, that he was not created by it, that he does not hold to it.
that he does not derive his rights from it.

War and peace

For those who see things rather than words, the scourge of war is born of the natural interplay of life's forces.
of life. It is not an exceptional state, not a marvellous and rare occurrence, but the
on the contrary, the almost constant, always fearsome effect of tense passions and interests
interests. All you have to do is let go: both lead to armed struggle, between individuals and nations alike.

between individuals as well as between nations; the Peace that puts an end to them is born of deep, energetic and powerful work,
and, as soon as it stops, so does peace. We understand nothing of peace if we do not see it
the masterpiece of political art in social, national and international life.

To create this masterpiece, everyone must want it. To destroy it, all it takes is one. The
disrupter can be ourselves. But it can also be someone else. To reason as if it were enough to
to destroy the instincts, wills and forces of war within us, or within a few of us.
that dominates everything else.

Whether these instincts persist in a single group of nations or in a single nation, nothing is done.
a single nation, nothing is done for peace: a single "mad dog of Europe", whoever he may be

be, will always be right about Peace.

We will not disturb the peace if we are just and wise, and if, true to the maxim of our kings
of our kings, we will always keep our wits about us.

But neither our reason, nor our justice, nor our wisdom will be enough to prevent Peace
from being disturbed; we would be less reasonable than animals if we failed
fail to realize that the peace of the Just and Wise will inevitably succumb the day it has the misfortune
the misfortune of arousing external lusts without appearing strong enough to guard it
the aggressor or usurper.

The one-sided language of the moralists may therefore seem adequate to the solution of this political
problem.
political problem, unless it receives a very strict complement, which can be formulated as follows

Yes, in a sense, Peace depends entirely on the moral virtues of One, but on the condition
that, if Wisdom and Justice are one virtue, Prudence is another, and a fourth
and a fourth virtue is called Strength.

Marx's disciples deal with a kind of good that moralists consider precious,
legitimate and pleasant, but determined, but counted and of such a nature that they diminish when
they are consumed and diminished when they are shared. The community of these goods
to a certain point, there always comes a time when they must be returned to individual
individual enjoyment and incorporate them into a personal or collective egoism, a "belly".
"belly 8". War is almost inherent in the sharing of similar goods.
by their very nature, they always make it possible and even threatening.

The great producer, the unbridled producer of material wealth, the worker who boasts
who prides himself on creating and multiplying the kind of goods whose essence is to be shared, creates
around him or within him powers of destruction which, as they develop, will act with an armed hand.
armed. For he will create mad jealousies. He'll intoxicate himself with his own dreams, and to help them

ripen more quickly, the suppression of all rivalries will offer itself and impose itself as the most prudent
of ambitions.
most prudent of ambitions. It will always be possible to entice these average elements into a
into a belligerent movement, those average elements who would themselves tend to prefer the pleasures
of consumption and enjoyment. This is how the spirit of equilibrium encouraged by
the first degree of work, thrift and the other so-called peaceful arts, is promptly broken
by the spirit of enterprise and initiative attached to all purely material techniques. We
We need to go beyond the concept of divisible wealth that can be stolen, to abolish this kind of
to the society of nations what theft is to the society of families.
families.

We'll fight less for material well-being when men and peoples are a little detached from it.
detached from it. Without this detachment, without this Catholic spirit, all future prospects
are inevitably warlike.

Even if the arguments of economic pacifism were not as false as tokens
they still don't solve anything. The question will only be resolved when humanity has regained
a community of thought, a community of faith, we begin to understand each other.

8 The word is by Jules Guesde.

between peoples. A matter of thought before being a matter of feeling.
A matter of reason before being rme a matter of justice or love.

Bichat's definition of life as the totality of forces resisting death has sometimes been derided as a vicious circle.
forces that resist death. This so-called circle is a profound philosophical view that pays tribute
the exceptional and marvellous quality of life's response to the relentless assaults
assaults from all sides.

Thus the notion of Peace, inspired by its true love and just esteem, must be conceived in relation
in relation to the infinite multitude of elements and powers that conspire sometimes to prevent it from being born, sometimes to destroy it.
or to destroy it as soon as it is born.

Pacifists ignore the price of peace: they assume that peace is ready-made, natural, simple,
spontaneously generated on our globe. But it has to be made. It is the product of human will
and human art. No, there is no more beautiful and noble quality than that of peace. But
it only suits the hero who does it. He doesn't find it under rm chou. To do it, he
must wield the tools called weapons. Before the bomb and the grenade, it was the sword.
Before the sword, the club and the stick.

Our morality is weak. We believe that things keep themselves. We
believe that peace comes from nature. Not so. Peace requires a great deal of effort,
intelligence, dedication and sacrifice. The past of the human race is there to remind us
that for nations and families alike, it is more difficult to preserve than to acquire and conquer.
conquer.

Part Five

Democracy

The birth of democracy: liberalism

The classical liberals and their anarchic-democratic posterity, born in 1789, professed that one man is worth another.
that one man is as good as another, and hence also justify the abolition of social ranks,
the elimination of all variety in the status of provinces, towns and households.
of provinces, towns and households. Where the ancien régime saw a combination of beings differing in value, role and function.
function and who only became the same in the cemetery, the modern regime dreamed of a juxtaposition

juxtaposition of people assumed to be equal and identical. In applying this doctrine, politicians
politicians diluted it to soften its absurdities by adding contrary principles,
but, in its pure, unadulterated state, this is what it says, this is what it does, and nothing else.

Consequences of liberalism

1° The revolutionary spirit

To create discontent in order to obtain agitation, and finally to enjoy disorder, is the ordinary procedure of the revolutionary spirit.
of the revolutionary spirit.

The revolutionary spirit believes that politics is called upon to give prizes to individuals.
its only task is to make communities prosper. This confusion is the source of all its
from this confusion. Where universal wisdom thinks of collective happiness, public good, collective imitation,
i.e. Family, State, Race, Nation, the revolutionary thinks of private happiness and satisfactions
in other words, insurrection.

Revolutionary disorder, founded on an individualistic philosophy, has almost as many accomplices as there are people.
accomplices as there are mediocre, envious, foolish and rascally people in France.

Routine consists in blindly continuing what once had a reason to exist and no longer does. The
of the Revolution is to turn everything upside down for the sake of boots. The common
of Routine and Revolution is to stall: inertia.

The real Revolution is not the Revolution in the street, it's the revolutionary way of thinking.
revolutionary way of thinking.

To combat all social traditions, the revolutionary spirit first presented itself as the lieutenant of science.
science's lieutenant, its rightful heir, its presumptive inheritor. And the revolutionary
revolutionary spirit taught science against religions, but also against governments.

If, up to a point, the negation of the metaphysical and the revealed, the supernatural and the miraculous
the supernatural and the miraculous, could claim a certain general progress in knowledge of the physical
world.
physical world, it did not and could not contribute anything to this criticism of authorities and

inequalities on which democracy is essentially based. Democratic criticism is not physical
not physical, but metaphysical. It is not born of science, but of religion, and it is
false.

Recourse to foreigners

In France, the Revolution was the result of an effort by the foreigner and his henchmen to oust the
native.
the natives. This peaceful conquest cannot be achieved without the help of the worst. When a
foreign power establishes itself in a given country by force of arms, it summons the best
notables, princes and chiefs and, by imposing the delegation of its power, it holds them
responsible for the collection of taxes and the safety of its own agents. But when, instead
instead of consolidating the occupation, it opens the way for the invading army, it is the last dregs of the
people
of the people. He bribes demagogues to incite the wanderer
wanderer against the country's wealthy and working class. He strives to get
that those least interested in public order benefit from maximum public power. He makes
Revolution and disguises it as a Government: all too happy when he can, as he has
it can, as it did in France, obtain measures of constitution and general legislation
whose particular effects are repeated every day, giving advantage to the criminal over the honest man
advantage to the criminal over the honest man, to the bohemian over the citizen, finally establishing
and almost regular domination of the most egregious rascals. Such a government, not content
weakens all external defenses, it gives them away: it creates a state of mind of impatience and betrayal
of impatience and treachery; stunned by their impotence, exhausted by vexations and persecutions
people look for the policeman where he is, i.e. outside. The stranger takes on the role of liberator
liberator, and comes to pacify the disorders he has paid for. This was not only the case, as our naive
naive revolutionary historians believe, in the years 91 and 92 of the century before last.
All the Italian republics had recourse, in much the same way, to the same gendarme who
sometimes called the German Caesar, sometimes the podestate of some nearby castle.

And the Greek cities of Polybius' time!

And French conservatives in Hitler's time!

2 ° Anarchy

Anarchism is the logical form of democracy. But we can't stop at an
ideal anarchism. It's a principle that energetically demands its full realization. The spirit
of an anarchist, if he is upright, well endowed and consistent with himself, easily comes to
to conceive and desire the state of nature. I imagine that for him, for his doctrine, it's a pretty rough time.
pretty rough time.

The vanity of anarchy

Anarchy simply claims to destroy, to abolish forever, the bonds which, according to it,
enslave and dishonor mankind: yet, while we see it proceeding wholeheartedly with the destruction
the destruction it meditates on, we see it remaking in its own bosom, in its little city of anarchy
of anarchy, all that it has destroyed outside.

A strong contradiction that robs the anarchist program of its rational explanation and moral justification.

moral justification, for we have no right to destroy what we are obliged to rebuild without delay.
without delay. But that's not all: the social system thus reconciled is likely to be inferior
to prove inferior to the one it is intended to replace.

Assuming, for the sake of simplicity, that materials gathered in a day of improvisation
the test of time, and assuming that one generation,
today's, could be worth the countless generations that preceded it, the new
before it, the new social building will only meet immediate or very recent needs.
needs; it will meet ephemeral and partial necessities; it will represent the fruit of a
suggested by a small number of very limited needs. It will need constant
constant repairs, perpetual additions. It will hardly be enjoyed. It will constantly need
gaps and crevices. A rudimentary police force, a rudimentary justice system, army, navy and
diplomacy, that's what we're being offered to follow on from the diplomacy, navy
army, justice and police that the industry of thirty centuries of historical effort,
illuminated by millions of concrete facts, had composed at leisure.

Destroying the Society in order to rebuild it under these conditions is like proposing to tear apart an ocean liner
in order to extract a raft. I can't think of anything wilder. How is it that
anarchists never noticed?

I don't harbor childish dreams of indoctrinating men who have embraced the Revolution as a career.
as a career. But there are those whose destiny is not fixed and for whom reason raises their voice.
raise their voices. Then there are the young people. All French youth should hear themselves saying,

morning and night,
morning and night, that anarchism (and its successor, liberalism) is essentially a nincompoop.
nincompoop. It leads to no clear ideas. It brings no satisfaction, either in spirit or in fact.
or de facto satisfaction, apart from being a politician.

You can destroy a society, but you can't destroy society. Social necessity reveals and
imposes its power empirically on those who contest it in theory, and whose theory
can't even promise us a reduction in social charges. The social day they
will be no less burdensome than the one they suffer from; but, backed by weaker institutions
institutions, it will be less useful, less helpful and less powerful. The quality of authority may be
but all the more imperious, cumbersome, fussy and inclined to meddle in the smallest
and prone to meddling in the smallest details.

Such, in fact, was the result of our Revolution.

It destroyed monarchical authority, and established a much more vexatious administrative authority.
vexatious administrative authority. It dismantled the hierarchical collaboration of "orders" to establish
increasingly uncommunicative "classes".
classes" that communicate less and less and are in open warfare. A highly perfected social type,
the liberalism of 1789 brought us down to an elementary type.
anarchism take us further down?

The reign of democracy

What is democratism? The practical man will ask, by whom is this abstract doctrine professed in France?

and, since it reigns, who are the men it owes its reign to?
The simplest examination of the situation leads to the answer that they are not men.

Men would not have had the means to carry out this tour de force. Just think
the greatest, most ancient, most venerable spiritual power on the one hand, and on the other, material
force
material force, those who carry the sword, who hold the gun, who point the cannon are held in check
persecuted by a simple system of institutions and ideas: democracy!

Men would have weakened, divided, quarreled and devoured each other by
administering this institution and this system. We must therefore assume something else, an
organization
organization, I specify historical organizations, physical or psychological families
or psychological families, states of mind, feeling and will inherited from father to son over many
traditional companies, dynasties.

Jewish and metacultural dynasties.

Foreign dynasties, such as those that fomented the French Revolution.

This Poilu of the Great War had an instinct for this historical mechanism.
asked what he would do with the defeated Germans:

We'll hang their Emperor and turn them into a Republic.

The defenders of democracy, those who are not altogether lacking in sense and intelligence,
are pure mystics: their opinion is supported by a mixture of daydreams and truly subjective impulses.
subjective impulses. Neither the history of men, nor the study of their nature
democratism as a superior principle.

The French Revolution put France in a material state that was very close to democratic individualism.
democratic individualism. All national organizations have been shattered, the individual
became dust. From then on, foreign organizations never ceased to grow and take root in France.
to take root in French society, as their inner discipline was maintained and strengthened
strengthened by our fragmentation. The democratic doctrine that makes the State a providence
providence, and of the citizen as the administered and the pensioner, is their most powerful
propaganda and conquest.

Preventing the French from organizing and qualifying outside the State and the Administration,
which they use as their instrument, is therefore the natural program of these
organizations if they wish to continue their domination among us.

Democracy is not organized

1° Political theorists call democracy any government (crateo) entrusted to the
majority (demos), that is, derived from the wills of the greatest number, individual wills
added together. The ideal democracy would be one in which all legislative and administrative
would faithfully but exclusively express the sum of these wills, which,
to be added up, they must be conceived as equal to each other, whatever the differences in their value.
differences in their value. Essentially, democracy is based on the system of equal political
political value of individuals.

2° Biologists also admit that, in a living body, an organ is a differentiated element.
differentiated, that is, created or made distinct from other elements by the particular
it has received. The liver and the brain, the heart and the stomach, belong to the same body, are made of
the same fundamental elements.
body, are made of the same fundamental elements, but have different qualities and
They are organs.

There are living beings that are almost inorganized: these are what we call inferior animals, in which all
the cellular elements, identical to one another, are made up of the same basic elements.

identical to one another in nature and position, subject to the same regime, also do
same regime, also do the same work; the decision of the whole is merely the total of the decision of the individual cells.

parts. But as soon as these lower lives are organized, as can be seen in animal colonies
the system of equality changes so much that it disappears. Each element or
applies itself to some particular function, more or less useful, pleasurable, noble and active,
noble and active, and these functions and elements subordinate themselves to one another:
as a result of this division of labor, and also as a result of the resulting order, each
function is performed much faster and much better. There is thus progress, but at the same time
inequality.

As we climb the animal ladder, these inequalities become more numerous, more profound
more numerous, more profound and ' if we insist on it, more shocking. They are a direct result of organic
organic perfection. If equality is the formula for justice, then higher vertebrates are pure monuments
pure monuments of immanent injustice, since elements of the same original composition
are used for functions as cruelly unequal as are, for example, the sensitive and digestive functions.
digestion. The elements having acquired very different qualities, the
power of the whole is not vested in the greatest number of these elements, but in those
those best qualified to see and foresee: the organs of sensibility and movement.
of movement.

You who speak of giving or giving back organs to our people, that's what an organ is.
organ. Don't talk about organs anymore, don't borrow a metaphor from biology in sociology
or agree that an organ is an element of differentiation, i.e. of inequality:
because organization develops quality and diminishes the importance of numbers.
Do you agree with this truth? Then don't talk to us about organizing a democracy,
i.e. tempering a government of equality with inequality, or use the proper word, and agree with us that
agree with us that organizing a democracy is tantamount to destroying it.

To the power of money

Progress as conceived by Democracy tends to provide the individual with lifelong resources,
but by making him dependent on capitalist organizations, external to and superior to him, of which the
State is at times the manager and at times the administrator.
The state is sometimes the manager, sometimes the president, sometimes the absolute master.

The ideal of democratic progress makes the poor citizen not, strictly speaking, a rentier of the State, but a ward of the State.
but a ward and serf of the State.

In a state that has fallen into democracy, its natural powers (political, diplomatic, military) tend to disappear,
military) tend to disappear, but others are created in exchange. Initially a hospitable
schoolmaster, purveyor of the fine arts, churchwarden, match and tobacco merchant
and tobacco merchant, he tends to become the universal cupbearer and bread-bearer. He takes bread and wine wherever it's available
cellar of the rich, then of the not-so-rich, then of the most humble possessor, and when the
and, when wealth has melted away, he administers famine and presides over hunger.

No matter how you look at it, in a democracy, money is the source of power.
It chooses, creates and generates power. It is the arbiter of democratic power, because without it
because without it, power falls back into nothingness or chaos. No money, no newspapers. No money, no
no voters. No money, no opinions. Money is the progenitor and father of all democratic
of all democratic power, of all elected power, of all power dependent on opinion.
opinion. This explains the fury of parliamentary discussions when they focus on the point at which money
money and the electorate, money and opinion, money and government.
government.

Each party tries to disgrace the other. But they are all dishonored insofar as they are democratic
democratic and recognize the right of power to be born as it is born. The crowd doesn't
It's all part of the farce. It's another chapter in this mockery.
mockery. Whichever way they turn, and whatever cry they utter, the poor people are governed by gold or silver.
governed by gold or paper, by those who hold them and by those who sell them.
their masters and leaders.

The love of money is common to regimes, peoples and men. There are variations
in the degree of this greed and avarice, but universal history shows no government
government that was free from the love of money or that could be absolutely free from its influence.
its influence. Only there are regimes that exist independently of it. There are
others to which it directly gives rise and which would not exist without it. The Regent, for example
for example, could be a greedy and avaricious politician. He was not the creature of money. His
authority came from a source other than finance. Finance was not the source of his power,
the shameful ties that bound him to the gropers were abominable personal accidents that
disappeared with him. Morally, he had none of the excuses of the Panama schemers.
He had royal blood in his veins, which owed nothing to gold. But what aggravated his crime
also gave hope to the elective "right".

Corrupt and corruptive, these were the prince's vices. They did not stem from principle. With him dead

all it took was for an honest, moderate prince to succeed him for integrity to regain its rights. At
instead, in a democracy, the elected official may be virtuous, but he is nonetheless the product and the producer,
the effect and cause of the sovereign plutocracy. It appointed him, he supports it, it regenerates its authority
regenerates his authority by having his mandate renewed, and he defends it as best he can against justice and the nation.
and against the nation.

There is no example of this terrible circle ever having been broken other than by substituting native hereditary right to elective right.

Hereditary law, by virtue of the inherent weaknesses of the human heart, can lead once,
twice, ten times to money scandals. Popular right, by the very energy of its natural movement necessarily and always, and more and more.

Elections: a means of democratic government

Evil is not the fact of an election, it's the elective system extended to everything, it's democracy. "Democracy is death".

Universal suffrage

Whenever we show what political, economic, intellectual and moral evil the elective system has done, done and will do to France by the elective system, there's no shortage of simpletons to respond:

- So, you don't want any more voters or elected representatives So, you don't want the nation to have a voice?
be heard? Do you want all its affairs to be done from on high, without it having the right to say a word about its rights?
to have a say in their rights?

The nincompoops add:

We see you coming, it's universal suffrage you're after.

We have so little in the way of universal suffrage that we'd like to hang on to it. We would like

children, who cannot vote, to be represented by their parents' suffrage.
their parents. We would like to see women vote, at least those who represent an existence
not bound by the bonds of marriage, an interest not confused with the complex interests of the
interests. Universal suffrage doesn't "scare" us at all. We are afraid of the things
to which it is applied. But in relation to those things, in relation to government, to sovereignty
censal suffrage is as absurd, as incompetent as universal suffrage.
universal suffrage. In the old Germany, the Republic of Princes, the choice of sovereign was made by
seven electors.
sovereign was chosen by seven electors: this choice of superior by a handful of inferiors
no less harm to ancient Germany than the same choice does to modern France
when made by millions of voters. The harm comes not from the number of voters, but from the object
but from the object on which they vote. If they are given to decide on the tendencies of the
Government, if they are
to choose the leader, it's a ten thousand-to-one bet that they'll elect the man whose nose they like
will please them and who will have no more brain than a calabash; there are ten thousand to one to bet
that they will demand from the government the policy of their particular interest, sacrificing the general
interest.
the policy of least effort and least labor, with no concern for the distant present
or the near future. The electoral princes of Germany acted in this respect in exactly the same way as the
sovereign citizens of the Republic of Germany.
as the sovereign citizens of the French Republic. The last thing on either
will be the public interest.

Insofar as it is emancipated from the State and exercised with a certain degree of freedom, the election is
not a thing in itself.
a thing in itself, to be dealt with professionally, apart from anything else.
Election is to opinion what shadow is to the body, what reflection is to the image. The electoral
The electoral spirit forgets the action and propaganda of the idea to chase the single mirage of the vote.
All is undone
all is lost on the evening of an electoral defeat, when the labor of several seasons
tended only to win seats.

That's why the Sovereign Public Interest, that's why the Governing Chief, responsible for the public
interest
for the public interest, must not be left to the fortunes of the election, whether settled by dozens
or by millions of men. This general abandonment is absurd in itself.
the disturbances that elections of this importance, weight and gravity cause the nation.
cause the nation.

Democracy consists in giving general and superior direction, government and sovereignty to the number
expressing itself.
sovereignty to the numbers expressing themselves through suffrage. It is not the universality of suffrage
to be deplored. It's the point of application and the distorted competence. This is what
that it ignores the most, that it is most incapable of directing, namely the State, the central and sovereign
State.
that suffrage is consulted, through democracy, and it is on this that it operates most actively.

actively.

Universal suffrage is conservative

We have never thought of abolishing universal suffrage. It can be said that universal suffrage
universal suffrage should elect a representation and not a government, without wanting to abolish this suffrage, and wanting just the opposite.

For this suffrage, among its many virtues and vices, possesses a fundamental property,
inherent in its very being: universal suffrage is conservative.

Plebiscitary theorists are not wrong to compare universal suffrage to the "mass" of physicists.
physicists. It is about as "inert" as they come. Their mistake is to misapply this truth, and

to regard inert suffrage either as a means of creating the Sovereign, or as a spring
of opposition and revolution. Their error on the first point is obvious. On the second
second, it suffices to consider that it takes a very strong prestige, a very powerful popularity to move
to move, to shake a heavy mass of wills that agree only in the idea of a profound rest.
deep repose. Appeal to the people can be a useful and powerful lever in times of trouble, when the
when the government is hesitating and inclining towards death. It is of little
in other cases. It is worth nothing against a well-constituted, strong, united party, determined to exploit the nation to the bone.

Outside of critical hours, and as long as any material order seems to subsist, universal suffrage preserves everything that exists, everything that is not.
universal suffrage preserves everything that exists, everything that tends to exist. It preserves that which power, of that which seems to benefit from success: radical, if the government tends towards radicalism; socialist, if the government tends towards socialism.
to radicalism; socialist, if socialism appears to dominate government.

The crowd acquiesces, follows and approves what is done above and beyond its head. It takes
to break its murmur of approval. The crowd is like the mass
inert like it. The violence of riotous days is still a phenomenon of inertia.
of inertia; it follows the line of least effort; it is less hard to follow shameful or ferocious inclinations than to resist them.
or ferocious inclinations than to resist them by reflection and will. The ability to react, very unevenly distributed
distributed, only reaches its fullness in a small number of chosen beings, the only ones capable of conceiving and
and accomplish anything other than what is.

Numbers say amen, universal suffrage is conservative.

The democratic state: the French Republic

The evil machine

In the Republic, we don't live in the realm of deliberate, considered reasons, but in the order of brute causes.
but in the realm of brute causes.

The ebb and flow of opinion, office routines, official agitation and parades, colonial lusts
the operations of parliamentary and financial groups, these discontinuous impulses do not make
make up a policy.

A conservative and patriotic voter should take stock of the cost of such a
machine. Sacrifices of money. They are considerable during election time. Sacrifices
of ideas, judgment, conviction and sometimes honor: he's going to great lengths for someone
who does not represent his thinking, or even a thinking that is tolerable to him in the religious,
social, economic and national order. In the final analysis, this someone is defeated, with no other benefit
than to have dispersed, demoralized and discouraged an ever-growing number of brave Frenchmen.

We should reflect that, if this is the rule of the game - and it is - there ~ is nothing more immoral or dissolving
than to call this error law and rule this sin.

Under the name of equality, what it does is not order, it's unacknowledged anarchy, covered up,
and we may well ask whether a naked, raw anarchy would not be less dangerous than the inveterate
practice of this rule and law.

Democracy obscurely venerates anarchy as its frank, bold and pure expression.
When the misfortunes of the times force it to fight against it, it secretly undergoes its fascination.
it is always from this side that it will fall as soon as an external cause ceases to impress it.
ceases to impress it.

The Republic, in the spirit of its foundation and logic, must admit no year, no family
family, nor classes, nor savings, nor Property, nor order, nor fatherland, nor anything that is national Du social. Its revolutionary point of departure means that it must complacently let the revolutionary program, if not to carry it out itself.

The government of things

Who does not feel, who does not see the profound reason for the extreme precariousness of the good under the
republican regime? Nothing stops it, nothing fixes it. No institution is charged with capitalizing on the lessons of experience.
lessons of experience. No stable, self-perpetuating magistracy is capable of withstanding
to resist the blind upheavals of a deluded opinion.

The weakness of its men counts for infinitely little compared to the harmfulness of the regime. From
What are we complaining about? *That important interests are dragged out and then suddenly resolved by
by improvisations that are more than dangerous. The scandal is twofold. But it emerges
of irresponsibility in time. Every minute of this time, you can
rm minister to puff up his chest, cover up for subordinates, claim credit for this or that act.
this or that act. But three months or three weeks down the line, the minister has changed, he's changed
in person, he's changed, he's changed.
changed himself, his group and his party, and it's impossible to find the author of such
the author of such slowness, such negligence, such procrastination,
by a miracle, he answers coldly that, having said yes, then no, he has merely suffered
objective necessities. They are variable and have made him vary.

They alone count. They govern. If they loosen their grip on factions and assemblies
and assemblies, we relax too and do nothing. Press them, and one is pressed, and one botches
what should have been seriously matured and deeply meditated. In short, man abdicates
to the government of dumb things. Let's imagine rm chariot
any man thus abandoned to the law of blind forces! It's the same law we apply to the chariot
of the state.

The republic is an oligarchy

Such is the "continuation" of the regime for the government of the nation and for the general affairs of the State itself.
of the State itself, where its incompetence and incapacity are notorious.

But there are some matters of its own in which the Republic shows a certain continuity
continuity and even a certain know-how: its religious policy (a sectarian policy), the constant
sectarian politics), the constant elements of its party politics, the art of serving and remunerating the electorate.
These are the new realities that need to be seen.

In the Republic, there are no checks on the Republic, although in the monarchy there are checks on the monarch's will.
brakes on the monarch's will. Royalty means Royal Councils, States of the People. Democracy
democracy means a double government: the apparent one, that of numbers, and the real one, that of oligarchies and the wealthy.
oligarchies and gold.

Let's look at the average composition of the groups that, around Power, exert influence and, and, on occasion, move authority. Like all the world's governments, as soon as it is established the Republic is, in sum, a government of families. A few thousands of families occupy, through assemblies and administrations, what are called the avenues of power. They form what we might also call the axis of this power. Many changes are made and unmade around this axis. But the axis itself remains unchanged.

Republican heredity is no empty word. Nor is republican nobility. Even socialist, Henri Salengro asks to succeed Roger Salengro.

So-called democratic equality plays the role of an attractive and disruptive lie.

Republican defense consists in maintaining its traditional form. It's all about keeping the pork barrel of power: doctrinal and passionate democratism for a real oligarchy. oligarchy.

Parliamentarianism

Mandatory instability

MPs are mandated by their constituents to engineer ministerial crises. It is through and the threat of crises that the people's representatives obtain from the executive power the favors and indulgences they secretly seek from the executive. Every to be a minister or a friend of ministers. In a Parliament of over eight hundred members, this requires a rotation of ministerial staff. The cabinets must follow with a certain frequency.

Under these conditions, the control exercised by such ephemeral ministers cannot be serious. serious. The hallmark of a minister is to ignore his administration. He works to maintain himself, to succeed, he maneuvers on parliamentary terrain. The House, the Senate, his cabinet for the day when he receives senators or deputies - that's the country he knows. He sometimes sometimes... For the rest, things go as they go, and, inevitably, at their worst.

In France, as everywhere else, there's a mass of men busy with their daily bread or pleasure, who will never pay attention to what's at stake.
who will never be attentive to their most general and profound interests.

It is for them that the republican regime is cruel: for such a regime presupposes that they are capable of spontaneously providing for their own salvation.

spontaneously provide for its own salvation and, since this is not true, this regime, so active when it defends itself, finds itself without resources to defend the country, which remains uncovered and dismantled. Those who would appear to have the mission of foreseeing and preparing are

are pressed by other interests!

Lack of national spirit

Logically, the Republic is a negation: the exclusion of a hereditary ruler and opposition to his return. his return. In reality, it's a spirit, a spirit that may occasionally agree with the national interest, but cannot be that national interest.
national interest, but which cannot be that interest, which must be something else altogether, being a spirit of internal struggle
division, the spirit of a party, of a collection of parties. Experience shows
shows that this party, when it governs France, is usually dominated by other views.

than the national interest, religious views, social views, even in its foreign policy.
when it's not governing, it's even worse, ruthlessly attacking all national realities,
destroying our navy for the benefit of England under Louis XVI, declaring war on the world
for the pleasure of overthrowing the same monarch; then during the thirty-three years of the Restoration and the July government, fighting relentlessly against all peace policies,
favorable to German expansion and Prussian progress, later applauding the setbacks
France's natural allies, Sadowa in 1866, the fall of Charles of Habsburg in 1918,1920,
1921.

I don't think we can argue with this tendency of the republican spirit. It is confirmed by
It is confirmed by all its acts, it is attested by the volumes of its writers in verse and prose. He can sacrifice
sacrifice himself to the fatherland, just as he can prefer himself to it: naturally, he is something other than our fatherland.
homeland. It is adherence to a kind of religious confession whose temporal interests are not our national interests.
our national interests.

As the republican spirit is thus tempted by the defense or expansion of its own cause, it constantly runs the risk of making the wrong choice.
the risk of making the wrong choice: the assault is so powerful, the resistance so mediocre!
It's true that most Republicans are Frenchmen like us, but if patriotism is in their hearts
their hearts, their political minds are formed of conceptions that are a patriotic and can tend to become unpatriotic.
become unpatriotic. Don't let this word mislead you! Patriote began by meaning

citizen of the world, and it retained this meaning as long as it was strictly republican.
When usage brought it into line with its etymology, it became more or less suspect. All republican
republican policy being more or less inspired by confessional methods applied to
applied to Europe, applied to Work, to Social Life, destroys the nation, rather than preserving it, as is the function of Politics.
that is the function of Politics.

The reign of the Chamber, and parliamentary government in general in France, is thus evolving more and more towards the type of Benefactor without obligation or sanction.

People get elected in order to profit, and to make a few big electors profit. The true republicans, the strictly observant democrats, are increasingly abandoning the notion of the community of national interests. They know only their own, and they excel at showing it every day of their lives.

It is the domination of the interests, passions and wills of one party over the major interests of the French people, over the conditions of their existence.
conditions of their existence.

Pure parliamentarianism, or the reign of money

We know without a doubt that parliamentarianism was never "the palladium of liberty".
of freedom".

We alone, of all peoples, have had pure parliamentarianism. Pure from the arbitration of monarchy, since we were in a Republic. Pure from the direction of the Church, because we were in anticlericalism. Pure from the control of the great national bodies, since the Révolution la Revolution and its enforcers, the Consulate and the Empire, had done everything in their power not only to destroy these bodies
not only to destroy these bodies, but to prevent them from reconstituting themselves in a lasting and vibrant way.
French parliamentarianism could not even meet or support the kind of guardians and counterweights or counterbalances comparable to those that still exist and function in Switzerland's cantonal
the vestige of the high traditions of the English Crown that the United States
called their High Court of Justice, and which our paper reformers are foolish enough to call their own.

to believe they can transplant with a stroke of the pen the qualities of impartiality and independence!

We had pure parliamentarianism. In other words, this reign of parliamentarians

parliamentarians, the domination of Money.

The Press verifies, day by day, anecdote by anecdote, how, from voter to elected representative, from elected representative to minister
minister, the minister again to the elected official and the voter, everything is dealt with, settled and, more or less
more or less, with dirty money.

The democratic and parliamentary republic "is" centralization

Parliamentary or plebiscitary, no republic can decentralize. Let's make one thing clear
the i's and t's. I'm not saying that there is no such thing as a decentralized republic. I know about Switzerland
Switzerland and the United States. What I'm saying is that a republic, whether parliamentary or plebiscitary
parliamentary or plebiscitary, cannot move to a decentralized state. And this for a reason
easy to grasp: the major public powers are elective. The government, whoever it may be
therefore has a vested interest in being re-elected by keeping the largest possible number
administrators of public services, in other words, to centralize. The more
devotion, the more likely it is that this elective central power will be able to hold on to its electorate.
civil servants are the most valuable means of communication between the electorate and the central government.

Far from wanting to decentralize, an elective government must want the opposite.
of a democratic republic is, in fact, democratic state socialism: the masterpiece of centralization.
masterpiece of centralization and functionalism. The mechanism of administrative
is so effective, its effects so powerful and continuous, that it tends to govern not only the workings
not only the workings of the political order, but also the best elements of the social body.

Direct consequences of centralization

1° The intermediary

In a governmental system where thirty-nine million men, filed and classified in countless
are subject to uniform and meticulous general regulations for every detail of their
every detail of their individual, social and civic existence, discussion is continuous,
and inextinguishable on the methods of application: doubtful cases are innumerable, and whatever
whatever the grave danger of favoritism that the discussion of these individual cases may present
the automatic application of regulations would entail moral and material difficulties, and
and even more serious inequities. From the centralizing law to the subjects of that law, there must be a constant intermediary.
constant intermediary. From the administered to the administrators, a permanent advocate is needed,
powerful over the administration. As long as centralization enslaves and oppresses the electorate, it will need a spokesperson, an advocate.
need a spokesman, a well-armed spokesman at the heart of things, and this elected representative must be

made with his own hands, kneaded from his own clay, and decked out in the modest colors of his hometown.

National bureaucracy is an abuse that this abuse of parliamentarism tempers. The parochial necessary to the good people, this popular need gives a naive measure of the obscure but very profound harm done to the State by the centralized system consubstantial with the republican system.
republican regime.

Do away with centralization, and have the state regulate itself on the spot.
without the oblique intervention of the governing party, most administrative, judicial and fiscal matters that

the citizen king's existence, the deputy's popularity is likely to disappear. It
disappear in a democracy where centralization is on the increase, even and especially when decentralization.

The halter of consular institutions is not loosened by the deputy, but the victim, the citizen,
but the victim, the citizen, the people, finds in him an organ through which to breathe and sigh.
the MP he knows, the MP he frequents, the man from a well-defined constituency, the one constituency, the one he knows how to make a real representative, a direct
instrument.

The real mandate of the deputy or senator, which is what makes it valuable and worthwhile, applies to operations that take place neither in France nor abroad.
operations that take place neither in the Chamber nor even in the corridors of the Palais Bourbon.
Palais Bourbon. The real office, the interesting service of the people's elected representative, consists in taking
I was going to say in favor of his constituent.

Favour would be a misnomer and unfair. There is no favor when there is necessity: and necessity, here, is not in doubt. The tightly woven network of our administrative machinery actually requires this continuous mediation between the Parisian ministerial offices and the litigant in the periphery.

The only specific case in which a citizen can obtain personal guarantees against the
the State is when he becomes a regular client of some elective power.

2° Bureaucracy: the proliferation of civil servants

In a normal country, even one that is the best constituted in the world, too many civil servants expose

the State to many demands.
to be subjected to many demands. But when the State is based entirely on elections, it is at their mercy.
the state is at their mercy: all it takes is for civil servants to agree to restrain it, which in no way advances their business or the business of the state.
neither their business nor the business of the country.

The model State comprises the smallest possible number of civil servants, all of them
well chosen, well paid and well defended. All monopolies, all parasitic functions
that are not essentially proper to the State, must be returned to private initiative.
to private initiative. Former state employees must soon realize that they can earn a better living in the private sector.
that they earn a better, more secure and more independent living in most branches of industry
in most branches of industry and private administration.

The very large number of small salaries is more costly than the small number of large ones.
the small number of large salaries, and the government of the Numero
disgrace inflicted on the most important ones: quality and importance are
quality and importance are roundly sacrificed! The more important the social service, the more it is envied,
defamed, politically scorned.

For example, as the common bulwark for everything and everyone, the army is reduced to starvation wages and,
and, as there is, in front of the army that supports the war, an elite corps whose mission is to defend the peace, this corps, which is the only one of its kind in the world, is the only one of its kind in the world.
to defend peace, this corps, the diplomatic corps, is also the one whose allowances are least
least proportionate to its responsibilities'. An obvious democratic inevitability: must we not divert resources
should be diverted to maintaining onerous monopolies and subsidizing the electoral mass and
and electoral agents?

And there's more. Democracy naturally abolishes the gratuitous servants we might call
honorary servants who devoted themselves to the State in exchange for a little prestige, consideration and dignity.
consideration and dignity. When the State loses its majesty, when its consideration is surrendered
political arbitrariness, when its prestige is no longer a noun or even a word in everyday conversation
when its prestige is no longer a household name or even a common word in conversation. He himself, moreover, is not
is not keen on it.

These kinds of service involve independence and pride: jealousy, envy,

jealousy, envy, the shady spirit of inequality and uniformity that are the lifeblood of every democracy these virtues. Those who have them are therefore excluded, eliminated, almost automatically, from the services of the State.
from the services of the State: religion, class, origin, political ideas, so many pretexts
pretexts! You don't have to be squeamish to overcome such barriers. Well-bred people
who are well-to-do and who would be proud to play, with little or no subsidy
administrative or judicial role of the first or second rank.
men of this kind, so common in other times, can only be very rare among us.
us. They don't even rub up against it anymore 9 . The advanced parties have shown them all too well how important they are.
of them: the pace of democracy requires the periodic purging of public employment
the same way as the cyclical worsening of its budgets.

3 ° Statism

There is no contradiction to be resolved, but a consequence to be noted, between social statism and social individualism.
social individualism. A logician who starts from the sovereignty of the individual, and who wants to build a State, may die before he can do so.
to build a state, may die before he has emerged from the fundamental self and raised his system.
system; but, if he builds it, if he builds it on this individualistic foundation, he cannot
the despotism of the state Theoretically, his state is the most absolute of absolute
absolute of absolute sovereigns, since it is the emanation of a total of incoercible individual
individual sovereignties, and receives from them all their strength, all their authority, all their majesty.
In practice, being the sole product of these sovereign wills, and unable to tolerate any group
between it and the individual, this State holds people and property at the mercy of its law.
Each individual stands alone against the State, the sign of tones, and all units can thus be crushed one by one by the united mass.
in turn by the united and coherent mass of others. These units have the right and duty to form a bloc, and
the latter, faced with their coalition, can in fact and in law only suffer.

When the State becomes everything, the State is nothing: this is a thesis that can be supported and proven. But the same thesis establishes that each citizen then falls below nothing.

When everyone has to act in order for someone to act, everyone ceases to act, at least with initiative and progress, and our social activity falls to nothing.
with initiative and progress, and our social activity becomes a mechanical repetition, slower and slower and even tending towards inertia, of the singular and personal activities that still exist.
The Republic's financial management weakens the production of wealth. Financial management
This weak production is paralyzed by financial management, while consumption is redoubled.

The limits of justice in the Republic

Our justice system is powerless because of this initial fact, which dominates the question: we wanted to give it too much.

too much. We wanted to give it everything. We wanted to absorb the Political into the Just, and to the universality of the Judicial Order what is strictly the domain of the State.

There are, from time to time, various "adjustments". They are quickly left behind by other expenses.

no raison d'État. And it's because there is a raison d'État that the State must be constituted so carefully! That it must concentrate the maximum of wisdom, conscience, prudence prudence, personality and justice! Only a highly personal State, deeply aware of its personal responsibilities can usefully exercise the high prerogatives of the extra-judicial or, if you like, hyper-judicial prerogatives. The greater the value of this State, the greater the value of its applications of the raison d'État.
applications of the raison d'État. If your State is abused in its shares, if it is the slave of Finance or the Finance or the foreigner from within, they will be very miserable.
instead of serving and protecting national salvation, its raison d'État will serve the "higher interests of the Republic",
in other words, the successive and changing interests of factions.

Recourse to the "fait du prince" will be all the more vile in that it will be neither admitted nor invoked directly. The claim to treat everything regularly, judicially and formally, will have the
to distort the very form of justice, and to pass off as the pure expression of the law
expression of the law. The aim will be to eliminate all intervention by the "arbitrary" T in order to avoid abuses.
abuses; but in exchange, we'll have gained judicial hypocrisy, with its continuous
chronic violations and endemic falsifications. When
legitimate authority does not exist, its function, which is both etemal and necessary, is usurped by the first slave
by the first slave who comes along. No power superior to the written law exists, and the Law is not incarnated in
sovereignty capable of saying: "I am the Law", we will see all magistrates come to
magistrates will come, out of political necessity, to defraud the law, thus gradually depriving the law of all authority.
authority. A law that is habitually twisted loses all prestige and value.

It will lose them all the more as the law's applicators and interpreters are themselves diminished and humiliated.

Who will write a detailed history of the French magistracy since the "purge" of Martin Feuillée?

Who will count the cases in which the equals or superiors of Procureur Général Fabre of the

the Rochette affair were able to moan about one or other of the "greatest humiliations of their lives"!

The parties

The nature of parties

What is the government of the Republic? The government of parties, or nothing.

What is a party? A division, a sharing. The "words of the tribe" often offer a sacred
sacred context that contains, conserves and preserves their meaning. Here, the meaning is crystal clear. Just close your eyes
close your eyes and listen to the sound. Gone! Let's open our eyes again: does the spectacle contradict hearing and understanding?
understanding?

In the normal functioning of the regime, no political result can be achieved except by this divisive
divisive operation and internal struggle. It's the way to the top. It's the party game
that elects. Once elected, you can preach agreement, but only after you've made a formal commitment not to return to the electorate.

Where do parties come from? Or rather, what is it that gives parties and clans this incurable
ardor that time sometimes only refreshes and renews? Our natural clans

are destroyed, our historical clans seem to have been wiped out. But the classes remain and
our State is constituted in such a way as to do more harm than good.

Revolutionaries always exploit them, striving to legitimize them through non-existent economic antagonisms.
antagonisms, because far from diverging, our most essential interests actually converge.
The general interest, while not the sum of particular interests, nevertheless encompasses and envelops them.
envelops them: the highest, deepest interests of each individual tend, on the real level, towards the unity of the whole.
of the whole. Sharing and division are scourges from which everyone will suffer: yet, however beautiful appeals for conciliation, concession and convergence of actions and views, this natural
natural idea remains cold compared to the artificial heat and factitious fury
to which divisive passions raise their false doctrine.

The element that generates parties is passionate and, almost always, personal. One man, one name
name serves as a flag, and this flag flutters and throbs all the more brightly when a pretext has been provided

has been provided, either by deluded ambition, or by a denial of justice or its semblance, or by vengeance taken or suffered.

France is torn apart because those who govern her are not statesmen, but party men.
but party men. Honest, they think only of the good of a party: dishonest, of lining their own pockets.
to line their own pockets. Both are enemies of France. France is not a
party.

In a country as constituted as France, in a country that is not entirely represented by either
neither by its aristocracy nor by its bourgeoisie, the Republic has lasted only because it has been the property of a party, of a bourgeoisie.
of a party, a closed party, organized jealously enough to withstand all assaults.

Party ideas, divisive ideas, have passionate agents in the Republic.
idea, the idea of the fatherland, has neither a devoted servant nor an armed guardian.

War cannot be waged without provisions and ammunition. In their war, the parties must live and fight to live and fight with whatever they can get their hands on.

Agreement with foreigners is the essential and classic ingredient of the party system. Possible and contingent under any other government, it is necessary in the Republic. We must either change or resign ourselves to this evil.

In much the same way, you have to change the regime or resign yourself to a certain amount of routine in the major administrations.
to a certain amount of routine in the major administrations, of which the Navy and the War Department are typical.
1 The revolutionary spirit that animates the parties does not triumph over routine.

Parliament's revolutionary control has never done more than superimpose incomparably superior incomparably superior abuses. All the evil that can be said of offices, routine if you like, but
but competent and experienced, can never be weighed against the insanity of a parliamentary committee

of a parliamentary committee or delegate, often ignorant or turbulent,
a jack-of-all-trades by definition.

Nowhere in the essence of the republican system is it stated, written or thought that military issues that military matters, matters relating to the life of the fatherland, are superior to the Republic, superior to party quarrels.
party quarrels. The most patriotic of our republicans dodge this question of the priority
of the Patrie or the Partis, of France or the Republic, by saying that these are two synonyms
and that the Republican State and the French State are one and the same.

But the nature of things takes care of the distinction, and it is then that, as events unfold
events, the reactions of each individual give the measure of people, characters and minds.
people, characters and spirits.

Parties, including the Communist Party, are known, reputed and avowed to be syndicates of
of personal interests designed to maintain state parasitism.

The old Republican Party

The old republican party created the Republic and boasts about it: the Republic created its current situation and
and profits from it. The mechanism of this historic double action is not difficult to grasp.
To make the republic, it was necessary to pursue the partisans of the previous regimes, to note them, to expel them from public employment and to give them everything they had.
them out of public office, and immediately give them successors who were interested in maintaining
of things. The first revolution created a clientele by selling off national property; the third
Third Republic recruited its clientele by "purifying" the national administration and repopulating it with its creatures.
repopulating it with its own creatures.

In this way, a vast plexus of interests was formed, kept alive by the fear of disgrace
disgrace and the desire for advancement. All these interests, it must be said, are wonderfully disciplined.
marvellous. They have complete confidence in their leaders; and these, in turn, do not "let go" of their clients.
their customers. This tacit bilateral contract was once known as the "Republican Union".
union". It ' could change its name and even be called the radical socialist union.
that the personnel, apart from a few heads, will be the same.
and will be governed by the same interests of individuals and clans.

Yes, the interests of a race, of a vast family. The united interests of a certain number of thousand
men. The Masonic lodge and the central committee were the two focal points in each county town.
and they were represented in the smallest hamlets by a trusted emissary,
rural letter carrier, schoolteacher or small tobacconist.

And there were intelligent people there; and there were also infinitely stupid people. But neither stupidity
But neither stupidity nor intelligence were the hallmarks of this curious brigade. Not even
appetites! Not even greed or hatred. Many of these people were rich. There
were even honest. However, the figures of these original republicans, of these
republicans who founded the Republic, naïve or refined, corrupt or honest, Spartan or Athenian
or Athenian, all bear the same trait: a gift for talking, intriguing and leading the crowd.
crowd. All are born demagogues. They remain demagogues wherever you visit them.
council of Fouilly les Oies or in the offices of the Chambre, at the tribune of the Sénat
as well as at the lame tables of one-eyed estaminets.

Where did they learn this? Where did they learn this art of success in assemblies? No one and no one can deny that they possess it. This is quite independent of eloquence, authority or personal merit.

This speciality, which certainly does not belong to the country's finest, does not correspond, either, in any way, to the good average of the French.
the average French quality.

But it's almost an ethnic or professional trait: a similar instinct makes for good sailors or farmers.
good farmers.

One is born a demagogue just as one is born a Jew. Just as Jews are apt to handle gold, so old republicans are apt to handle gold.
old republicans are apt to "handle" assemblies.

I've compared them to the Jews. And here's a new similarity. Jewish gold is sterile. It only only makes gold. So is the demagogic aptitude of the old Republican party. This party of nothing nothing conceived, nothing produced. It is political by career and profession; and it has nothing political political. No doubt it has waged war on the Conservatives, but by virtue of a method far more he had to dispossess in order to possess in turn.

It's the process of a horde in a conquered land. Ours has got its hands on jobs and profits.
and profits: we'd be hard pressed to say what kind of conduct, what kind of plans or general views on our internal or external affairs, with the exception, it must be said except, it must be said, on the anticlerical front. The results have been harmful both inside and out, and yet
yet it is with this party alone that the Republic is possible.

The process hardly varies.

The old Republican party acts first. It acts through laws or decrees; then it says to the voters voters: "Choose between me (i.e., between the revolutions I've made) and the unknown, mysterious and the unknown revolution, the mysterious anarchy, the dreadful civil war that would break out if I, I revolutionary government, revolutionary but a government, were not there to measure, hold back and measure everything.
measure everything.

The great errors of the mind are the source of most disturbances of action. But it's is impossible to have been more completely mistaken about ideas and things than the sincere, fanatical fanatical element of the Old Republican Party.

The founders of the Republic, those who found themselves, a hundred and fifty years ago, in the presence
the fruit of the Capetian labor, the kingdom of France, the civilization of France, had two guiding ideas.

ideas. The first was that all of this had to be changed, because this political, social and moral composite was not good or bad,
The first was that everything had to be changed, because this political, social and moral composite was no good or worthless, and had to be rebuilt from top to bottom. "Something else,
but not this! This was the first point of their idealism. Secondly, these reformers
some wanted parliament, as in England, others democracy, as in Switzerland,
all of them wanted Protestantism, as in Prussia.
to the Reformation; our hierarchical aristocracies under the King seemed lamentable to them
and peasantry of the Cantons; finally, the energetic concentration of political power
political power in the hands of the successors of Louis the Great and Henry the
Great seemed to them a tyranny, compared to the chatter of the chambers and the "regime of cabinets".
cabinets". All the idealism of the time stemmed from a threefold dissatisfaction with ourselves. We dreamed, in three forms, of religious, social and political "progress" in the direction of types deemed superior,
social and political. Today, we can measure the three setbacks born of this triple effort.

The Liberal Party

The Liberal Party has stuck to the old themes of youth, according to which there was antagonism between a nation and its government. The cooperation of the city and its magistrates with the citizens, the fraternal solidarity of states with their subjects, the profound reciprocity of services based on the absolute community of their interests - these strong truths very present today to every young and lively mind, graspable in the examination of every half a century ago, by the metaphysical-legal problem of the right to self-government.
metaphysical problem of the balance and division of Powers. Auguste Comte

this political and moral nonsense with the same mixture of mockery and wrath that he to all the successors of revolutionary anarchy, in order to criticize what he already called the most harmful and backward of parties. Except in the Palais, where this Byzantinism is still rife, much less so than in the past, the new generations are free of it. They see
the public with the government, instead of against it. They see the magistrate, the leader
as a protector or guide, a director (rex), not as an enemy.

The liberal cannot think without the aid of this outdated method. Isn't he the government? Then he is the opposition. Not in power? Then it has a mandate to put every conceivable obstacle imaginable in the wheels of power. No middle ground between direct exercise and

direct opposition, absolute power and absolute criticism. Don't talk to him about collaboration. Or what would you like to say? He doesn't understand this language. As head of government, he will bring the same frenzy to using authority that he uses today to agitate against it. his raging liberalism into violent Jacobinism, but in both cases, he will apply his in both cases, he will apply to his governmental procedure the mark, or better said, the blemish of the revolutionary spirit that cannot conceive of society as a whole. revolutionary spirit, which cannot conceive of national society under a regime of union and peace. It must always divide them against themselves: instead of striving for happy convergence, it clashes he clashes irreconcilable differences in an eternal dualism, with the more or less avowed intention of intention of exploiting them to the full.

This is the spirit, the theology of the regime. If liberalism were not moderated by the good feeling of the danger it poses to the country's internal peace, it would not be able to shirk its responsibilities indefinitely. indefinitely from its logical consequences, authorized by the famous precedents of of 1792 and 1871. Double the foreign war with a civil war? After all, why not! Metaphysics from another age, which can serve to measure the high antiquity of the fossil that serves it to us. us. It also measures the antiquity and fossility of the Republic.

The Radical Party

This party is sufficiently defined by its horde of varied destroyers, who can be divided may be divided by personal hatreds or competitive appetites, but united by a collective collective food around a thought that disciplines them.

Which comes first, this food, this thought? Is it the religion of disorder, the taste for disorganization disorganization, that throws them on France's moral and material capital? 7 Or is its critical verve critical verve ignited by the prospect of plunder and its profits? The answer to to this question should necessarily vary with the individual and the period of their career. In any case, the two motives go hand in hand.

These two ways of understanding the Revolution don't get in each other's way, and the forces of the mind forces of the mind that tends to destroy and the aspirations of the purse that wants to fill up. In this association of disinterestedness and concupiscence, the doctrine adds authority authority, majesty and grandiloquence to the interests that serve it. which it would lack altogether if left to its own devices. The The former seduces and reassures the naive, the latter baits and rallies the rascals.

How could this doctrine of division and this work of wastefulness have become of division and this work of waste which tend only to kill it? Drumont sometimes notes it's hard to imagine a people destroying itself with its own hands. But it's easy to imagine a people destroying another people, and the better to destroy it, deceiving, intoxicating and poisoning it. poisoning them. Judith of Bethulia isn't always a beautiful widow: there are ideas, ideas, ideas, ideas.

mirages that, for a while at least, seem more beautiful than Judith; when Judith
Judith is called a philosophy, a sensibility, a school or a literary fashion and when this prestige
prestige, this charm are well known to be, for sure, murderous, it's enough to know how to direct
rm enemy. This is what France has been doing since the end of the 18th century,
foreigners from within, helped by those from without, the English and the Prussians.

No doubt the infatuation with the Jean Jacquiste error has long ceased to be spontaneous.
spontaneous, but it has also long since been used to complete the political operations
political operations to seize top positions in the Administration
administration, universities and academies, from where they are at ease to impose the nightingales
nightingales of a hundred and twenty years ago. Having instilled in their adversaries, in the country's
leaders, all the ideas and sentiments
Capable of weakening us and thus enslaving us, the four Confederate States
confederate states (Jewish, Protestant, Masonic, Methectic) 1 will rule as long as we are subject to the
legal authority
that has remained under the empire of their poison.

They need to finish establishing their doctrine: hence the hostility to Catholicism, particularly to the
Catholic school.
Catholic schools. They had to maintain centralization: hence the need to limit socialist concessions
socialist concessions to the precise point where the administration loses control of the workers' groups
groups and allow them the slightest autonomy; otherwise, accentuate state socialism
the opposite, accentuate state socialism by enriching workers' unionism with the most powerful
unionism. Finally, they must avoid alarming the middle regions of public opinion with an overly
subversive programme.
subversive program. Lying to the center, pouncing on the Catholic right and yielding to the left
that's the radical program.

On the triple aim, everyone agrees: statism to dominate, anti-clericalism to pervert
Opportunism to avoid being swept away.

...And opportunism has been increasingly prevalent for some time now. With opportunism, corruption
corruption, bribery and swindling.

1. The four Confederate States: In rm Council of Ministers held in September 1898, as the last
opponents of the
opponents of the revision of the Dreyfus trial denounced the power of Jews, Protestants and
and Freemasons, M. Henri Brisson, President of the Council and Minister of the Interior
and Minister of the Interior, vigorously defended the three accused groups, exclaiming in the course of
his
that Jews, Freemasons and Protestants were THE BACKBONE OF THE REPUBLICAN

REPUBLICAN REGIME. For this skeleton to be complete, we must add a group unjustly omitted unjustly omitted by M. Brisson, the foreign group of metèques settled in France in the place protected and favored by the laws of the "French" Republic.

These four oligarchies, all deeply international in nature, powerful and ruling, have been called the Four Confederate States.

We realize that a distinction needs to be made between Protestants, and we've made it. many of them are deeply rooted in their hearts and souls in the land of France. in the land of France, and neither their patriotism nor their nationalism can be called into question. but the more "advanced" among them have allowed themselves to be denationalized. It is to an essentially Protestant to an essentially Protestant team that we owe the anarchic elementary school, the foundation of the Buissons, the Pécauts, Steeg, all powerful in the State.

The Socialist Party

What is socialism? It's a solution to the problem posed by democracy. The The will of the many, being queen of the state, cannot but tend to become queen of society, that is, of the economic order, in the factory, the office, the field, everywhere. Don't say it would be the ruin of everything. The Number will never believe it. If it is the master of the State, it will always act in such a way as to seize control of the State. to seize the wealth produced and the means of production in order to share them. This is inevitable. There are democrats who tend towards this result by decreeing that everything will be a state function, a state monopoly, with every citizen becoming a civil servant. This is

State socialism: it springs from the heart and bowels of democracy. problem it poses by posing itself. Others believe that democratic equality, already achieved in the State in the State, will be pursued in society by means of the suction pump of taxation, with the State, to impoverish them, so that it can enrich the lazy few. This fiscal socialism, another offshoot of the democratic viscera, provides a second solution. a second solution. Orthodox socialism or scientific communism provides a slightly different, more pompous solution, more pompous, more precious, apparently embracing a more complex and advanced more complex and advanced industrial organization, but it can and should only be counted only as one of the solutions to the Tunique problem, the terms of which have been laid down aligned from the very first moment when democracy, having achieved its first object, takes hold of public power. The Number, if it is master, can only tend to obtain from the nation what it needs.

In one way or another, some dictatorship of the proletariat must allow the Numbers to feed themselves without doing anything.
without doing anything.

Disregarding the socialist solution itself, 'disregarding even state socialism, is to solve nothing, and to leave all the problems unresolved.
solve nothing, and leave all the x's on the blackboard. Are you a democrat? Of course! The
democracy wants to become oecocratic (mistress of the house), plutocratic (mistress of wealth).
It exists only through and for this will. What's your answer? Yes ? No ? If it's
no, you're not a democrat. If yes, all the disadvantages of socialism reappear. If
it's neither yes nor no, everything happens as if it were yes. The hungers, thirsts, appetites and lusts
appetites and lusts aroused by the mere word "democracy", give themselves career, they reign over the voter,
by the voter over the State, by the State over the finances, and there you are, as the other said, at the wheel.

The Communist Party

How does communism differ from revolutionary socialism? In method, in that it
accelerates disorder. In doctrine, in that it does not accept the compromises of bourgeois democracy.
democracy: it is egalitarian in its destruction, authoritarian and even hierarchical
when it claims to rebuild according to the interests and views of a party. The system
of oligarchy (Masonic and Jewish) that the French Republic practices without saying so, Communism
Communism institutes it in broad daylight, and even admits to it.

But let's not get lost in these nuances. From a slightly higher angle, what is socialism or "communism"?
socialism or more or less "scientific" "communism"?

It's the spirit of the democratic republic; it's even the spirit of liberalism.
the economy and labor. What, said the advanced to the doctrinaire
the doctrinaires of Louis Philippe's time, you establish a constitutional monarchy in the State and
you would preserve absolute monarchy in the factory? We balk, we quibble,
but that's the point. If everyone's a king, everyone must be a boss. If business

If the common affairs of the nation are well managed by the will of all, how can the will of all not
manage even better the particular affairs of a business and a company?
manage the particular affairs of a trade or industry even better?
industry? From the point of view of the general interest, the slope is straightforward: if the political common good
says: Republic, the economic and social common good must say: Communism, all the more so.
with all the more reason. For he who can do more can do less. If elected power is excellent for the

House of France
France, it must be even better for the House of Dupont and Durand.

You can plead the law - the law of inheritance, the rights of property! I understand this social legitimism. But there was a political legitimism that alleged the hereditary right of a royal family, its right, the fruit of the most useful and powerful secular work command of the country, which it had constituted like a tenant farm or a workshop.

This political legitimism is scorned by the Republicans. Why shouldn't socialists and communists social legitimism of today's bourgeois republicans?
today?

Conclusion: from radicalism to communism, little or no difference

Distinguishing between social and political revolution is absolutely pointless. All democracies democracies in history have made the double journey; Article 1 said political equality and, when this theoretical equality was accepted, it was necessary to say, in Article 2, social equality.
terms do not belong to different series, their essence is the same, they respond to the same same needs. In Greece and Italy, every democratic constitution had the effect of gradually the "rich" with the burdens of the city, leading to the most sordid methods of sordid methods of political obstruction, civic cowardice and social impoverishment.

Thriving cities, great states and veritable empires were thus ruined in five short years.

The Communists represent a strict observance less informed, less attentive to the political and social constitution of this country, as it results from the institutions of An VIII, their Judeo-Moscutan Marxism omits or pretends to omit the facilities of slow revolution and gradual spoliation.
spoliation.

At heart, however, it is only a stimulant and an auxiliary.

Stimulating, to prevent socialists from falling asleep in their prebends, pro-consulates and under-secretaries.
pro consulates and sub-secretariats. Auxiliary, for the big night. In society, as in nature as in nature, it happens that things proceed at first by highly nuanced, almost insensitive degrees. but there comes a time when every evolution needs to be completed by the intervention of this intervention of that "great midwife of societies" called Force. This act of force more or less brutal, more or less explosive, would certainly not be accomplished by the bourgeois of the parliamentary socialist type. But the Communists are there:
once they've "torched" a certain number of floors and houses, the parliamentary socialists parliamentary socialists, having given them short shrift at the gates of the Palais Bourbon, will be busy to put these fires, pillages and murders into neat and tidy articles of law.

For the left-wing parties, there is never any question of doctrine or even program.
A single watchword, a single interest: the fight against reaction.

A well-born radical will never allow himself to be enrolled under a banner suspected of reaction. He'll be shown a strip of red cloth * just as the bull charges, the radical will march. Tel

radical is simply following his habits, another follows his passion. He walks, and that's essential. He walks in such a way as to meet his socialist brothers around the Urn, on which the country's fate depends.
on which the fate of the country depends.

This conjunction of the radical and the socialist, which cries out for immorality, is the most natural thing in the world.
of the world.

It's as natural, to say the least, as the final conjunction of socialist and communist.
How can we not see this more clearly?

It can't be said too often: there are two distinct traits in socialism, and the most important is not the one that gives the socialist its identity.
is not the one that gives socialism its name, the plan to settle the so-called social question, more specifically, the workers' question, as it arises in large-scale industry.
industry. This socialism, the most vigorous, the best defined, is not that of the big battalions. The industry in France is not sufficiently developed, despite the war and post-war period, to to explain the presence of many socialists to the left of the radicals. But in the most regions of France, where rural life, craftsmanship, small-scale industry and small commerce, socialist used to mean extreme republican, "ox-blooded" republican ultra radical. In those days, this extremism and excess applied to ideas. A long time ago Republican ideas ceased to inspire enthusiasm or confidence a long time ago. Their their fanaticism has fallen deeply. The faint residue that remains is much less a state of mind a state of mind than to an interest, or rather to the idea of an interest, but a private and quasi personal interest. The socialist of the Midi, for example, tends above all to realize the statist democratic program: everyone a civil servant, a small job for everyone, on a plan ingenuous egalitarianism. That's just what the radicals want. From then on, both want and must want big budgets, with big spoliating taxes.

But the radical, a member of an organization where the big bourgeoisie is not unrepresented, tends to set the point of spoliation a little lower than the socialist would. The former the gendarmes against people who possess more than the hundred thousand francs he has in his wallet. in his wallet. The latter, armed with his socialist or revolutionary pitchfork the suction pump to fifty, twenty or ten thousand. The principle is the same, because because the feeling that inspires it is also the same: envy.

Let's not delude ourselves, nor let ourselves be taken in by a handful of long-toothed charlatans. A thorough analysis of the electoral conspiracy reveals this, and absolutely nothing else. We're reliving the days of the Ancient City, when whenever a certain degree of material material civilization has been reached, when plutocracy, maneuvering democracy, has made patriciate and royalty, the collective goods, including the spiritual and moral treasures moral treasures that went with them, were wrapped up in the same ruin. They are, as they should be, by means of the same furious struggle between the poor and the rich, between the troop of happy producers and the crowd of poor, greedy consumers who find it to seize the fruits of their labor, first by legislation, then by riot, sacking and killing. killing. There is no difference between these factional games today and two thousand years ago. thousand years ago. Political democracy makes social democracy. The principle of equality attached to The principle of equality attached to the suffrage capacity of individuals needs to be extended to the ownership of things. There isn't a conservative democrat capable of a little thought and follow-through who could make a decent decent answer to the question.

Why aren't you a communist?

113

Diluted communism is called socialism. Diluted socialism is called radicalism, democratism, republicanism. Whatever the degree to which the poison principle is solved, we realize that it naturally, necessarily kills the City and the State, the Homeland and Humanity. Humanity.

114

Part Six
Social issues

The economy

The economy, being the science and art of feeding citizens and families, of inviting them to the banquet of a prosperous and fruitful life, is one of the necessary ends of all politics. to the banquet of a prosperous and fruitful life, is one of the necessary ends of all politics. It is more important than politics. It must therefore come after politics, as the end comes after the means after the means, as the end is placed at the end of the road, for, once again, it is the road the path you take if you want to reach the end.

In economic matters, even more than in politics, the first force is the credit that comes from of confidence.

Economic growth encourages political progress.

Economic order is the order of nature

The liberal doctrine asserts that the social good results mechanically from the natural play of economic forces.
forces. But what does it know? As economic facts gradually disprove its fatalistic optimism its optimistic, fatalistic hope, it replies: just wait, equilibrium will occur on its own. itself. But this famous equilibrium doesn't happen. The advice of liberal economists economists is to us what a sect of naturalists would have been to mankind to sit back and wait for the earth to bear its own fruit and produce. fruits and harvests. If it had listened to such sounds, mankind would still be waiting or would have died of cold and want.

No, nature, no, the spontaneous play of natural laws is not enough to establish economic equilibrium. economic equilibrium. But let's beware: these laws, to which it would be foolish to devote blind, mystical
it would be even more foolish to neglect them. Let's cultivate, torment and even force even the ample and bizarre bosom of old nature; let us add to its strengths our own strength and wisdom,
our foresight and our interest, let's double them everywhere with ourselves. But let us be clear command things only on condition that we obey them. Harvest in winter, harvest in spring in spring, that's the impossible. Before reaping and harvesting, let us know the natural time of harvesting and reaping. And if we want to improve the economic order, let's know it. order, let's know it. Above all, let's be careful not to know any of its essential facts. facts. We would pay, as always, for our forgetfulness and ignorance, or rather, our people would pay for our great mistake.
would pay for our great mistake.

The relationship between economics and politics

It is not true to say that economic crises are always the causes of political crises.
Yet it would be wrong to say that they never are. The truth is that both are, in turn cause and effect. Some of the explosions of 1789 were the result of poverty, but, without the state of mind that philosophism had determined among rulers and ruled, the crises would have been more serious.

riots become revolutions? In 1848, without the dismissal of the national
the June Days would not have happened, but these workshops would never have been opened
without the political ideas of the February crisis.

In history, economic phenomena seem to play the role of exciter rather than determiner.
rather than a determinant; they are material rather than formal causes.

We don't believe in the welfare state, but the state does have other functions
than the gendarmerie. It has, if not the function of bursar, that of controller and president of the economy.
of the economy, and we understand that its protection must not stop at products.
first and foremost to the people who produce them.

What could be the future of the race, of the nation, if the State lost interest in the conditions
by life to its nationals.

The economic question and social laws

Say that our social laws have been built askew on a dual principle of class struggle and uniformity of organization.
uniformity of organization, you'll be close to the truth. You'll be right there if, opposing
principle to principle, you demand that we legislate or regulate by region and by profession
by region and by profession, after consulting the relevant authorities and obtaining the direct agreement of those concerned. But please
we no longer have to contend with the inevitability of the laws of economics, whose mechanical play would have determined an inevitable increase in the cost of living as a result of any rise in salary!

It's obvious," they say. It's not as obvious as that. The laws we formulate presuppose
all things being equal, no other factor intervening, no other more extensive law being
no other more extensive law being involved. Your law is true in a closed system.
I'd be obliged to sell at a higher price if, by paying more to workers who wouldn't produce a corresponding
10 , if, I repeat, I were obliged to make the same profits as before,
but whether I am in fact obliged to make these profits is a hypothesis that has been verified in some cases and disproved in others.
in some cases, and denied in others, because a loss of profit is not necessarily a loss
cause for bankruptcy or liquidation: you can earn less and still do your business well.
business; moreover, it is neither inconceivable nor unprecedented that an increase in the
that an increase in the worker's salary should lead to an improvement or increase in the product.

Are you going to tell me that workers don't want this? That the bosses don't want that? That may be
may be their right, but the expression of their will, the exercise of that right, is not the fatal play
of a natural law. Other ideas and mores can modify these wills by civilizing them.
The antagonism between the two rights bears witness to the conflict between two barbarisms,
not a flexible natural necessity external to the wills.

In this corruption of language that marks our times, we lose sight of the meaning of the notion of law as a sign of succession between two facts. Rising wages and the price of food may be closely related, but this relationship can and must be must be corrected by other factors. Here, better administration. Here, more hard work. Higher up, streamlined finances to lighten public burdens, rational decentralization 11 , more vigilant study of commercial legislation. legislation. In any case, economic "law" cannot mean that a wealthy and prosperous country should be able to afford to pay the bills.

10 It was this added value that the Blum experiment failed to bring about, and even prevented altogether (1936-1937).

11 The Blum experiment proceeded in the opposite direction: centralization, tax increases, etc. (1936-1937).

population must starve every time workers' wages are increased, because it would be just as we might as well say that the law of gravity inevitably forces us to break our necks.

The Laws give a table of nature's constants.

It is up to man not to enslave himself to them, but to make use of their faithful advice. In the name of the fatal laws of physical fall, we're taking off in a balloon, perhaps even to the stars. The The fatalities of the economy must be composed with the good of the nation in mind. There is no protectionism, there is no such thing as free trade: there is vigilance and carelessness, there is the intelligent or resignation to their automatic, mechanical play, which, like all human resignation to the whims of nature, can only be disastrous. A material situation as complex as that of the French soil would require rme economic police economic police, but such a police force also presupposes a strong, lively State, dedicated to the interests of the French people, devoted to the interests of the whole country, not just one party; a state concerned with the future of the people and no longer condemned to struggle hopelessly through each of the most miserable difficulties of the present; a well-served state, a respected state, cm a state attentive to significant to interpret and translate into action every warning...

Classes

That there are classes, that recognition of this fact is the work of the most advanced parties,

this is undoubtedly the victory of common sense over the uniformity and equality
liberal democracy. It must be said and shouted that there are classes.
a statesman will have to take into account the community of interests and tastes
particular to the inhabitants of the same social zone. To act without taking this into account is tantamount to
to pose a problem by crossing out one of its main factors. But this essential factor is not
is not the only one, it is not essentially beneficial; there is nothing to show that it alone can bring about social peace.
peace.

While class may fight class, peace does not always reign within each class.
within each class. Peers are the most likely to kill each other. The rivalry between the Montagues and the
Capulets epitomizes the case of ruling aristocracies; but the bourgeoisie has nothing to envy them.
envy them, and we know the violent animosities that families of lawyers or merchants
of lawyers or merchants, and we see the same fratricidal struggles in what is now called the
today's working class.

These internecine wars can undoubtedly be appeased by a wise view of the common good?
But the same can be said of class-to-class struggles, thanks to the important
of interests that also exist from one to the other.

We can divide society into levels, tiers and zones, but this natural division is not the only one.
but this natural division is not the only one: from one level of the scale to the next, there are very close relationships of solidarity.
From the lowest to the highest. The bread industry and the building industry extend from the humblest
or urban life to the upper ranks of the highest society; solidarity between all those
all those who tend to create the same products can and must therefore be as lively and profound
as the solidarity of the same class; it is otherwise social and pacifying!

We prefer it. Without denying classes, we subordinate them to the trade associations that
bring all classes together, instead of parceling and dividing them.
and divide them.

Class and the individual

The individual who downgrades himself, if he does so without reason or too quickly, risks harming himself and others.
a double and triple harm that should be spared in the interests of each and all.
and everyone.

The revolutionary mindset believes that politics is called upon to distribute prizes to individuals.
that the political function is to make the community prosper. Where universal wisdom thinks
collective happiness, public good, collective unity, i.e. family, state, nation, the revolutionary
private happiness and satisfaction. Naturally, at the first sound of news
of the news, the individual rushes in, quivering, demanding his share. But he is deceived and his share is
in vain. What makes for the misfortune of the groups that generate it very rarely makes for its happiness.

the peace and order of these groups would very frequently make its own order and peace. The
impoverish the substance of a country, and anaemic a people, when we maintain that every intelligent
child
that every intelligent child must pass from manual labor in the fields to manual labor
from manual labor in the fields to manual labor with a pen, exchanging their smocks for the jackets and
blazers
the order of the community obviously suffers, but the holder of this transfer is neither enriched
is not necessarily enriched or improved by it; if he can be proud of it, this advancement
also entails a break in habits due to lack of preparation, which may cause him to suffer
exposing him to setbacks and sorrows that will not be compensated for.

Any objective mind realizes that the difficult thing is not to arrive, but to hold on from father to son.
social heights and even average positions are extremely difficult to hold on to
beyond the first or second generation: temptations are strong, softening is easy, falling
temptations are strong, softening is easy, downfall is likely. How would the tasks of social leadership be
carried out without
this powerful and vast spontaneous movement of secular translation that brings in the good and carries
away the bad?
the bad? The wonder is not that many replace themselves, but that a few are not replaced.
replaced. Some families endure because of the energy of their fiber, the solidity of their tradition
tradition and quality of effort. They are few in number. The State should help them: it's the elimination
which is what we call common law.

The historical truth about class

The Revolution changed the natural course and normal rhythm of life in France. We must therefore
be praised, and consequently blamed, for having invented something no historical event
invent: a fact as natural as the movement that renews the upper classes through the rise
the rise of families, sometimes even entire tribes, from the people. How could the
the military aristocracy in France after the Hundred Years' War or the Wars of Religion, so
the wars of religion, without the transfer movement that put the dress on the sword and renewed
the dress from top to bottom? How can we explain without a similar
reign of the vile bourgeoisie, as Saint Simon put it, without a similar movement, and which
the Third Estate to its apogee? Yet we cannot judge the customs of the Ancien Régime
Regime on the effects of a few ordinances issued barely two or three centuries before 1789
which bear witness to a reactionary thinking that was as fleeting as it was insane. Yes, the movement of
1789 was preceded by a bout of aristocratic fever that led to unfortunate misunderstandings
misunderstandings between two classes as close as the Tiers État and the Noblesse, and which also had
the

also had the misfortune of alienating part of the Noblesse from part of the people of Paris and various provinces. What, pray, are these anecdotes compared to ten centuries of continuous political wisdom? political wisdom?

The golden book of the patriciate eventually closed in Venice. In France, even in this final the ancien régime never ceased to admit the passage from one class to another. It admitted it. It protected it and, if need be, even favored it, depending on the times. But he didn't provoke it. Or, to put it another way, it didn't make it its duty to provoke these downgrades. The of this unnatural duty is precisely the blemish of the modern regime, or rather, for this regime does not exist.
or rather, because this regime does not exist because of this defect, the defect of the modern conception of the State.

All politicians worthy of the name, to whatever time and nation they may belong nation they belong to, know that a change in any respect is a matter worthy of the most and precautions.

For a man to change his land and, to use Maurice Barrés' expression, uproot himself, is a disturbance. a disturbance; it can be a happy and fruitful one if the uprooted individual finds without much delay and without causing a disturbance in the surrounding area, a better soil, more favorable to his aptitudes.
But we must be careful, and not assume that the mere fact of this change is a good in itself.

Likewise, for another man to change class is another disturbance, another risk. risk, which can be a happy one for the public as well as for the downgraded subject, if he or she joins to another class and other functions better suited to his personal conditions and virtues. personal virtues: here again, we mustn't believe that the mere fact of looking for it means that the desire for progress, even when followed by effort, even when crowned by apparent success, is progress itself.
is progress itself.

In a word, downgrading must be treated by the politician, if he is a nationalist, as an intrinsic evil intrinsic evil, from which may emerge great goods, or greater evils. The consideration of possible goods can make us overlook the temporary evil that is their condition: but the risk of possible evils must be taken into account.

This is the part of the account that the revolutionary spirit neglects, and must neglect. Being liberal, this spirit conceives only of individuals. Being egalitarian and democratic, this spirit values and abilities of individuals, without calculating the abilities of circumstances or and positional values. It will even be determined by its internal logic the latter and, equally, to exaggerate the former.

Social conflict

The legislator's first concern must be to remove the social domain from the passions and interests of politics.
political interests.

Social peace is like the peace of nations: it lasts through an effort that must be constantly renewed.
renewed.

The social question must be posed in relation to its object.

We pose it in subjective terms, i.e. in relation to the subjects involved: bosses, workers, proletarians, owners,
owners. This is natural in a democratic republic, where everything depends and must depend on the will of individuals.
depend on the will of the individuals who vote.

French citizens are divided into classes, according to the degree of wealth or rank they occupy,
or the rank to which they have risen. Hence these brutal formulas: those who have nothing versus those who have everything, those who toil against those who enjoy, etc., etc. The real, the solid, the

reality is absent from these accidental classifications. A rich peasant and a poor peasant
and a poor peasant, a country landowner and a farm laborer have, in reality, more common interests between them than a city proletarian and a country proletarian ever will,
a big-city rentier and a large sharecropper. Distribution into classes, into social zones
based on wealth or social rank is completely fictitious.

Each category has its poor and its rich, its proletarians and its owners,
its proletarians and its owners, the former helping the latter, the latter being helped by the former.

The old German Jewish cry: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!
from territorial district to territorial district, it was carried from profession to profession
profession to profession, social body to social body.

There isn't just one evil, the proletariat. There are two evils: the proletariat and capitalism. Their
the idea of their common antidote.

What antidote? The incorporation of the proletariat into society through the operation of political and moral forces other than capital: the political and moral forces other than capital: the political and moral forces other than capital.

forces other than capital: the forces of hereditary government, the Corporation and religion, which will strip Capital of its despotic ism, preventing it from reigning alone.

The peasant

Why isn't the peasant happy with the Republic's place in the world?
Why does the son of the French peasant change his profession? Why are the French countryside depopulating 9 why do we have to resort to hordes of foreigners in the age of major works? Why is the old Pont-Neuf still true, despite machinismo?
that the land is short of manpower?

The answer is simple. What the Republic could do for the peasant was very limited. The Kamchatka of its concessions to anti-democracy was to allow rural association, which yielded which bore excellent fruit. But this association was strictly limited to contemporaries.
The peasant could contract freely with his neighbors and relatives, as well as with his more distant colleagues.
more distant colleagues: he is forbidden to contract freely for the duration of time with those who descend or will descend from him. He has neither the freedom to test, nor the rights of substitution
the modern equivalent of the ancient birthright, and the land remains burdened with the heaviest the heaviest of servitudes, which are: equal sharing and, as an inescapable consequence, heavy mortgages

mortgages, leading to inevitable dispossession. A moral element, heredity, is the only one that ensures lasting possession of the first of all materials materials: soil.

A bourgeoisie of robins was the main beneficiary of the subdivision of the penultimate century. Where peasants vainly shared in the despoilment, the former owners were quickly were quickly avenged by the damage that has been inflicted on the small property ever since. I'm not I'm not one of those who see an insurmountable historical inevitability in the way the evolution of property towards depopulation and destruction. But once this destruction has been destruction has been achieved, once the large owner has been dispossessed, the small the creature of the financier and the property trader, he soon becomes its victim. victim.

The parasites live on him and strip him in no time. This parasitism cannot be avoided. parasitism; armed with the crushing transfer and inheritance taxes enacted by democracy, the

is there to devote small property to usury. And usury, in turn, reconstitutes estates traditional estates, sometimes larger ones, but collectively owned.
the sad legacy of the "anonymous and vagrant fortune" that dispossesses every farmer

farmer, poor or rich, noble or villain, of the country's crops.

Political systems have automatic effects, and the human will, however free, has little
have very few means of reversing them. The elective system presupposes the equality of voters, which presupposes the uniformity of functions.
uniformity of functions: if it is understood that one man is worth another, that one function is worth another
that one man is worth another, that one office is worth another, that one can be a peasant, a bourgeois, a member of parliament,
President of the Republic, no one will want to be a peasant any more, and everyone will be, more or less, a candidate for the presidency.
everyone will be, more or less, a candidate for the presidency. Democracy is a suction pump, and recole is the essential organ of this aspiration.
of this aspiration. We can't reform it. It is the regime that must be destroyed if we
interests, if we want to restore the course of honors and values.

The sterile regime has sterilized the nation. If the national choice does not go where it should, if the work
of the fields is not aided and continued, the chances of a national future will fall to so little
that the only means of opposing force to force, cause to cause, material factor to material factor in democracy
democracy will be lost by the simple fact of its abandonment.

How property is destroyed

There are advocates of small property. There are advocates of medium or large
property. I've never understood much about these kinds of divisions, when it's so easy to see that the large farms supported by the small estates are not the only ones to be destroyed.
realize that large estates with strong hereditary foundations are immense historical
historical assets, but that small and medium-sized holdings, properly defended
provide an admirable source of intelligent energy and measured activity.
energy and measured activity. Democrats are wont to proceed by exclusionary formulas
of exclusion, between which there is not much to conceive. On the contrary, we'll proceed
by added, compound, organized affirmations. It pleases us to hold under the same gaze
the different forms in which natural institutions intertwine and support each other.
Where the revolutionary spirit prophesies that this will kill that, we say that this can give birth to that, help that or fix that.
that, help that or arrange for that.

In order to develop, large-scale property needs to defend, guide and patronize :
just as, to resist and maintain itself, small property needs to be patronized, guided
and defended. But this mutual necessity is itself subject to a political condition.
political condition. These two properties require a state that is free from the bondage of gold. In order for
large and small properties can appeal to the Ministry of Gold without having to fear it
as the arbiter of all, the State must be powerful enough to dominate usury, wise enough to moderate

to moderate taxation and proportion it to the interests of national wealth, that which is incorporated
Finally, it must be self-controlled enough not to demand anything from democratic elections.

The worker

When reasoning about workers, the bourgeoisie thinks and speaks as it reproaches workers for living.
without concern for tomorrow, without foresight, without regard for the big picture.
the big picture. Don't confine yourselves to men's conversations, which often express
than the ideas of their world; take, as an expression of the sensibility of a class
class, what women say on the subject, and you will admire what can be added
to the spirit of justice, common sense and charity.

They say: "Isn't the worker happier than he used to be? Does he not live more amply, or
more comfortably? Are they not better clothed and housed? Doesn't he eat better? Yes, they are.
They forget that this is the general case. Life as a whole has improved in terms of material
and this progress, which is common to all, is not the progress of a single class.
grievances, if they exist, remain intact.

"Wages have risen", they add. They certainly have. But everything has gone up, including the
including the cost of living. And the previous remark still holds true. "Yes, but employers have never
been more
in charity and assistance. So many pay supplements, so many direct subsidies
so many direct subsidies from anonymous capital or the personal master...". And we add
if we're talking about our own: "My father, or my brother, is so good 1 My husband is so generous!
generous! What more do we want them to do?"

But nothing. Or rather, only one thing. Quite simply, madame or mademoiselle, this: let them
understand. Your father, your brother or your husband are not immortal.
immortal. They may have to stop working. Their good will,
mortal and changeable, like all living things, can disappear: from excellent to iniquitous
iniquitous, generous avaricious, benevolent vexatious and difficult. Everything that
depend on them? And must the condition of the worker be dragged into these
variations?

Your father's or your husband's kindness ensures that the proletarians who depend on him have a stable
position, a secure income and a job.
on him a stable position, a regulated future, an old age protected from the first
necessities. What if this kindness changes? What if a bill of sale replaces it with the indifference of a
"company"? Will you admit that everything else is called into question? That everything thought to be
stable has to start wobbling again? I'm not saying: it's not right, I'm saying: it's not possible,
because what we're talking about here is not an action, but a man capable of thinking and acting, who

must want to overturn this system of instability.
overthrow this system of oppressive instabilities. If you accept that it's impossible to leave it at that,
you'll see the real question, a question of principle: Will the worker be master of his own tomorrow?
tomorrow?

The question doesn't arise very strongly in small, skilled trades practiced in medium-sized localities.
in medium-sized communities. Where everyone knows everyone else, mores establish by themselves
a minimum of order and peace. Anarchic rigors are in fact softened. They are felt
in all their violence, in the vast agglomerations of large-scale industry, where thousands of
where thousands of individually hired workers occupy a place that may be worth a lot of money
but occupy it only by chance, for a day. Nothing guarantees it. Those who lose it
lose it, lose exactly everything they've got. If they haven't spared anything, they're left to reach out.
hand.

But then the voices we all know rise up: Too bad! It was theirs... ! It was their
business, when they earned a lot. Everyone has to work it out", etc. We do manage, and
as they can. It's a fact that the worker can't or doesn't know how to save. But,
since we preach to him to work it out, it's another fact that he works it out by associating, coalescing
with comrades. His system of arrangement is to demand, by coalition and strike
strike, the highest possible wages, either for savings or for other purposes. We don't have to ask
It's his business, it's his war. Yes. The case of class war
will be born or reborn when a class speaks of the duty of others instead of examining whether it is doing
its own.

its own.

Instead of picturing every worker as lazy, restless, dissipative, drunkard, let's picture a normal worker,
neither too industrious nor too soft.
a normal worker, neither too hard nor too soft, with an occasional elbow, but not an alcoholic,
a broad hand, not pierced; let's imagine him having a wife and children to support: I ask myself if this
proletarian so made
I ask whether this proletarian can easily admit that his future depends solely on the kindness of a good
man.
on the kindness of a good man, even a very good man, or on the largesse of a company that can cut him
off
from one day to the next? If this normal worker is left with no other resources
than to save on large, unstable salaries, aren't they then obliged, in good conscience, even in the name of
their duties as fathers and mothers?
the very name of his duties as a father and husband, to be demanding to the point of absurdity
absurdity, to the point of madness, to the point of destroying the industry that nurtures him? In this

case, only,
will ensure his future.

A situation without analogy in history. The serf had his land and the slave his master. The proletarian does not own his person, not being assured of the means to feed him. He has no "title", no "state". He is wild and vagabond. Qn can suffer what he suffers. But more than he suffers society itself. We understand the workers' question once we've seen what it is.
is.

The worker, who has only his work and his salary, must naturally apply his efforts to earn much by working little, with no qualms about exhausting the industry that employs him. Why should he
care about the future of things, in a world that doesn't care about the future of people?

Everything in his destiny brings him back to the present: he takes from it what the present can give. That he
pressure, it's possible. He's the first to be squeezed.

But he's still killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, which is no less stupid.

Let's say he is an idiot, my dear Sir. But what about you? You blame him for jeopardizing his future. future: so you're asking him to think about it; but do you want to tell me how a wage-earning proletarian
if it's not in the form of an ever-increasing salary, he'll have to imagine it.
he has to imagine it as the conquest of what you call your property, and of what he calls "the instrument of his power".
what he calls "the instrument of his production". These claims, perhaps insane, are those that born of the despair of a human being reduced to the sad fortune of a simple wage-earner. All forbade him reasonable foresight: his foresight became unreasonable.

It nevertheless produced magnificent virtues of mutual devotion.

Union honor and class unity are moral forces that should not be underestimated,
although they are horribly exploited, maximized and envenomed by democrat politicians.

And where does this exploitation come from? What enables it? produces it and, sometimes, necessitates it?

The bourgeois doesn't understand that, if he and the worker haven't yet seriously and cordially discussed

cordially, as citizens of the same people, as organs of the same State, the difficult
which obsesses them, is that democratic republican politics, in its most selfish interest
selfish interest, to pit them against each other on matters of facade and pure appearance!
Literate, cultured, masters of great leisure for reflection, the bourgeois has not been able to read what that the worker hanging Marianne's bust in front of the Bourse du Travail was able to decipher
the name and surname of the common enemy: politics! democracy!

Oh, it's not inferiority on your part, Mr. Bourgeois, it's rather foresight,
and in that foresight, timidity. You don't see the question, because you're afraid to ask it.

because of the very seriously worrying prospects it could open up for you.
For the question, the real question, which is to establish the proletariat, represents and entails on your part
certain concessions of substance, certain sacrifices of form, which would overhaul the entire
economic regime. Now, you see very well how far you can be made to go, to walk and run, if you enter into this dialogue.
if you go down that road. If you grant A, we'll ask for B, you'll have to go all the way to Z.
you'll have to go all the way to Z. You might as well defend everything, since you declare that you want to take everything, and that between
between those who defend themselves like you and the greedy, ambitious young class who attack you, no one is there, no one, to ensure that a fair and reciprocally
12 .

Work organization: guilds and syndicalism

The corporation

If, in the 12th century and for a long, long time after, if, on the eve of the Revolution, the corporation
corporation provided services, these services were not limited to the private benefit of its members.
public benefits, I say benefits for society. The worker
organized in the trade benefited from the immense strength that association and union add to every human unit.
added to every human unit; yes, but putting these imities in order helped to make society stable and prosperous.
stable and prosperous: it therefore involved discipline for the body and its members
members, for the group and for its individual members.

The individual, as we dare say 13, was not "free" to be happy, but was subject to the good and bad "force" of society.
the "force" of the group, being framed and regulated within the corporation at the very times when it was flourishing.
when the corporation was flourishing. And it wasn't the abuse of the framework or the rule that caused the corporation to perish.
corporation perished.

- The corporation declined not because it framed too much, but because it framed too little,

because, in the long run, the frameworks had become too narrow, too meticulous, and had lent themselves to the formation of monopolies.
to the creation of abusive monopolies, sometimes dangerous for the public, sometimes a nuisance for certain speculators and rope people whose power was growing. Despite
it was on this old, very reformable basis that national labor subsisted,
under royalty, the band of economists and roussians shook this base and tried to break it.
and wanted to break it, public sentiment rose up and put up such resistance that it was necessary to compromise and give ground.
ground. Complaints against the trade came not from "oppressed" members, but from the outside.
from outside, especially from theoretical politicians and businessmen, the old fetters generate
and exploiters, we had to back down. King Louis XVI had the good sense
back off: not enough, but a little. The Revolution did not back down. It issued the Le Chapelier decree which can be read in the note on page 2 of the Annuaire des syndicats 14 .

12 These lines were written as early as 1908, on the occasion of the Draveil Vigneux strikes. Work organization
corporation and unionism

13 If we're talking about French workers, let's not say the individual. This dog is an individual. This elm is an individual. The first living thing, however low you take it on the organic scale, is an individual.
individual. For a Man, for a Worker, for a Frenchman, I use the only appropriate term, I say it's a person.
a person and, by reinstating the proper word, I'm not just being grammatical, I'm preventing an error that logic would dictate.
error that logic would dictate: for if the individual is god, you don't put a leash on this individual dog you don't put a spit across this individual dog you don't put a spit across this individual dog you don't put a spit across this individual dog.
you don't put a spit across that chicken, you don't throw that wheat under the millstone

14 Here is the text of article III of the Le Chapelier law, year II: "If, contrary to the principles of Liberty and the
Constitution, citizens attached to the same professions, arts and trades, take deliberations or make agreements
agreements tending to refuse in concert or to accept only at a given price the help of their industry the said deliberations or agreements, whether or not accompanied by oaths, are declared unconstitutional
declared unconstitutional, prejudicial to Liberty and the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and of no effect".

This decree in no way came to the rescue of personal convenience: it was the expression of the Roussian roussian theory, and nothing else!

The spirit of this decree was to forbid workers (or bosses) to join forces "for their so-called common interests". Because their community was oppressive to one or the other? oppressive? No, because their unions and associations cast a shadow on the jealousy of a state which the Roussians, then called Jacobins, saw as absolute and limitless, free from all secondary societies, in accordance with the essential wish of the Social Contract. They against the interests and freedom of individuals, workers and employers alike that the famous decree was issued: the violent resistance it met with from the outset proves this abundantly. to prove it.

The history of workers in the 19th century is one long aspiration and ardent reaction of working people working-class people, working-class wills, against the regime of "individual" isolation imposed imposed by the Revolution, and maintained by Bonapartism and bourgeois liberalism Jacobinism, no less despotic, which had succeeded in imposing its insane doctrines on the July royalty. but was defeated (half-heartedly and in the wrong way) under the Second Empire, when the right of coalition when the right of coalition, finally recognized, was unleashed instead of organized.

Trade unionism

Union concentration responds to capitalist concentration, with similar weapons, and the struggle struggle will cease to be absolutely unequal; we'll either have to reckon with the organized mass of workers or resign ourselves to interrupting everything, paralyzing industry, the nation and civilization.

The latter hypothesis is unacceptable. The work has to be done. The modern world must to continue its own task, which is to develop our Earth. A treaty must therefore between warring principles, to the benefit of all. The relationship between labour and capital must be regulated by reciprocal commitments that allow them to grant each other equivalent guarantees of life, strength and prosperity on both sides.

Social war has its supporters. Whoever they are, whatever they want, they cannot want want this war to be temporary. And the immensity of the damage both sides are equally threatened with

the workers' camp more than the employers', in fact, will make it clear that the benefits of war that the advantages of war, of its toil, its exercise and its trials, can only be can only be seen as transitory. It's peace we have to come to anyway, and if we recognize that social social peace through socialism (or the pooling of all means of production) is a chimerical rudimentary and barbaric on the other, we are brought back to the reality of the reality, the first germ of corporate organization, which itself defines or suggests an agreement, defines or suggests an agreement. An agreement both industrial and moral, based on the type of work, inherent in the worker, and which recognizes that those who have no material property a moral property: that of their profession, a right: that of their professional group.

their professional group. This is the only idea that can pacify labor by giving it a law.

Workers and day laborers were also informed, by a decree of the Comité de Salut Publique on the second day of
prairial an II, that all those who joined forces in the professional arena to defend their alleged common interests
would be brought before the revolutionary tribunal. A petition was sent to the National Assembly
La Chapelier had it rejected, and decreed that workers' meetings were unconstitutional.
meetings were unconstitutional. Faon, on the podium, he proclaimed that there was only the particular interest of each
and the general interest of the government.

125

acceptable to all concerned. But labor pacification and legislation presuppose a political order.
political order. AS LONG AS THE AMBITIOUS AND THE SCHEMING FIND IN SOCIAL
THE LEGAL AND EASY MEANS OF PENETRATING ASSEMBLIES AND MINISTRIES.
ASSEMBLIES AND MINISTRIES, THE LAWS THEMSELVES WILL BE FORGED WITH A VIEW TO
TO PROVOKE AND FACILITATE THESE DISTURBANCES.

This regime is a bonus for agitators. It organizes and regulates their careers.
Anyone who preaches strikes and desertion is always rewarded by the election of the people.

You can't get there any other way. You have to pass through the low ranks of disruption and anarchy to become a guardian of order. The staff of the Republican Government is recruited by the Revolution.

126

Part Seven
Back to living things

France and the French

We put France first and, in the service of France, we strive to place right views and
and true ideas.

To be born in France and of old French blood, even though you come from the most
is still to be born the possessor of an immense capital and a sacred privilege. It means
to carry with you, within you, a title of inheritance. It means acquiring opportunities for moral and material progress
material progress that have not been so abundantly given to the sons of any other nation.

Long histories deserve, in the past, studious admiration; in the present, our filial devotion.
present, our filial devotion. That there is a France, that France remains, that this territorial
that this territorial, intellectual and moral treasure has come down to us through the centuries, is a blessing that every citizen
that every citizen and every man worthy of the name must strive to prolong and perpetuate.
perpetuate. Whether the end of each is inevitable, the workers of the future society have a duty to work for the future.
to work for the future, not, as we are told with rare silliness, according to old plans
plans, but on plans that conform to those great eternal laws that enabled the old plans to be followed.
plans to be followed.

The foundation of the French nation is only very powerful, the deposit of our traditions has only accumulated in the race and in the country.
in the race and in the country only because France exists as something other than a nation.
forty million living heads. Forty million living men, yes, but a billion dead men.
a billion dead men. That's the real foundation.

As France is politically prior to the French, French agriculture is superior to French peasants, French agriculture is superior to French peasants, French agriculture is superior to French peasants.
French industry is superior to French industry. Pasture and
ploughing, said Sully; the great minister of a great king was careful not to say: shepherds and ploughmen.
ploughmen.

The fatherland

La patrie -.fait de nature

Our homeland was not born of a contract between its children, nor is it the fruit of a pact between their wills.
between their wills: this is what the spirit of the late 19th century was already admitting. But
But it was also the reason why revolutionary individualists refused to serve, salute
refuse to serve, welcome or even accept the idea of a homeland. However, the idea of the fatherland
by the force of European threats: little by little, the Government had to patriotize itself
patriotize and militarize itself, in a word, in line with the greatest common interest.
common interest. But this de facto reaction, this instinctive and physical reaction, moreover
opposed by republican forces and interests, is not what justifies the idea of patria.

We are tempted to define it as an association of interests, but if the word "interests" carries a precious meaning, that of "association" destroys it.
but if the word "interests" carries a precious meaning, the word "association" destroys its effect.
will, and it was not our will that made us French. We did not want
our nationality, we neither deliberated nor even accepted it. Some defectors leave
those who stay don't choose to stay. It's a state they live with
and which, ten thousand times over, they don't even think about giving up. A
association lasts by the continuous act of personal will, but the fatherland lasts on the contrary
by a general activity superior in value, as well as in date, to the will of individuals. The
is a natural society, or, what amounts to the same thing, a historical one. Its decisive
is birth. You don't choose the land of your fathers as your homeland any more than you choose
one's father and mother. We are born French by chance, just as we can be born Montmorency or
Bourbon.
Montmorency or Bourbon. It is above all a phenomenon of heredity.

The democratic and republican sensibility that instinctively struggles against these ideas, and especially
against their consequences, does what it can.
and, above all, against their consequences, does what it can to escape them.

The French are our friends because they are French; they are not French because we elected them to be
our friends.
elected them as our friends. These friends are received from us: they are given to us by nature.
Let's never put the cart before the horse. Nor let it be said that, by putting in front what should be there
that by putting what should be there before it, we are sacrificing what follows, for what follows is only
good by being
in its place. Nothing would be more precious than to have the French united by bonds of friendship.
But,
to have them so, we must take the means and not limit ourselves to declarations and
inscriptions on walls. We can do more for the friendship of the French by explaining the origins and
strong reasons
reasons for their national community than by already imputing to them theoretical, compulsory
sympathies. Today's French people will be astonished if we start by affirming
the necessarily friendly nature of their civic relations, for social life is by no means an idyllic
social life is by no means an idyll, and the denials of this dream, which in fact continue to rain down
of disappointment and irritation by which effective friendship will be delayed.

On the contrary, the study of our ancient French kinship and its advantages enhanced by ten centuries
of gradual collaboration would awaken the sentiments by which our fathers united,
against the threatening enemy, around the friendly sceptre, the tutelary sword, the patron and defender
crown. Our history shows that, while it is true that states were founded on friendship
But it is also extremely untrue that, once founded, states can only survive on this basis. For
friendship had effects. It created heredity. It was this hereditary principle that came to the fore.
in the foreground. The very name "patrie" suggests this, as does the term "nation", which means birth or

nothing.
nation, which either says birth or says nothing.

Thus conceived in its historical marrow, in its hereditary essence, patriotism comes close
to all the ideas against which democracy has always railed.
repugnance that might still exist against the notion of inherited sovereignty. When
we understand that the function of a homeland is to withstand the storms of Time, when we conceive of
the nation, as Barrés did, in this way.
the nation, like Barrés, as "an eternal thing", when we know that France is not
a collection of individuals who vote, but a body of families who live, objections of principle
objections of principle vanish, and historical sense reclaims as necessity or propriety
at first seemed difficult.

Of course, the fatherland must behave justly. But it is not the problem of its conduct,
of its conduct, its movement, its action, that arises when it comes to considering or practicing patriotism.

patriotism, it's the question of his very being, the problem of his life or death.

To be just (or unjust), it must first be. It's sophistry to introduce the case
of justice, injustice or any other mode of the homeland in a chapter that deals solely with its being.
its being. You will thank and honor your father and mother because they are your father and mother
regardless of their personal title to your sympathy. You will respect and honor
the Patrie because it is she and you are you, regardless of the satisfactions she
your spirit of justice or your love of glory. Your father may be sent
to prison: you will honor him. Your country may commit great wrongs: you will begin
start by defending it, by keeping it safe and free. Justice will lose nothing in the process.
The first condition of a just homeland, as of any homeland, is to exist.
the second is to possess that independence of movement and freedom of voluntary action
without which justice is no more than a dream.

Patriotic egoism

Yes, man's help is due to all men. Oedipus and Don Juan agree.
However, I seem to remember that it's more advisable to help our neighbour first.
proximus is a superlative in sacred language, it follows that it's up to human beings to help us.
it follows that it is to those human beings who are least distant from us that the first
charity.

Is this selfishness? No: it's about us, our real us, the one called me. There is
any trace of egoism in first taking as the object of our care the people with whom fate

with whom we live. It's through a mobile set of metaphors that we say: national egoism or "sacred egoism".
sacred egoism". These collective egoisms have no single personal subject, who is
accountable. Criticisms of national egoism couched in this way have no purpose. Those who serve their does not serve himself. He devotes himself to something other than himself. And it is to this nearby group,
house, street, village, that a real and fruitful love of neighbor applies.

There are undoubtedly the Chinese and Tibetans whom I honor and admire, but they are a little far away
to benefit from. Let's start by giving our neighbor Ucalégon a helping hand,
especially if he's on fire - it's a principle of elementary morality, ratified by politics.

The nation

The idea of a nation is not a "cloud" as the anarchist cranks call it, it's the representation in abstract terms of a "nation".
it is the representation in abstract terms of a strong reality. The nation is the widest circle of community circles that are temporally solid and complete. Break it, and you strip
the individual. He will lose all his defense, all his support, all his help.

Free of his nation, he will not be free of scarcity, exploitation or violent death. We
conclude, in accordance with natural truth, that everything he is, everything he has, everything he loves is conditioned by the existence of the nation: if he wants to hold on to himself, he must defend it at all costs.
defend his nation at all costs. We're not making the nation into a God, a metaphysical absolute.
absolute, but at most, in a way, what the ancients would have called a goddess.
goddess. The Germans who deify Germany speak of its old God as Jehovah, alone, infinite and all-powerful,
infinite and all-powerful. A French goddess naturally enters into a relationship and composition with Jehovah.

the principles of international life that can limit and balance it. In a word, the nation
occupies the summit of the hierarchy of political ideas. Of these strong realities, it is the strongest, that's all.

Subsuming all other great common interests and holding them in its dependence, it is perfectly
that, in the event of conflict, all these interests must, by definition, yield to it.
In yielding to it, they yield to that which is most general in themselves.

The nation takes precedence over all groups within the nation. The defense of the whole imposes itself

on the parts.

In the order of realities, nations come first. Nations before classes. Nations before
before business.

The law of nations participates in their inequality. It therefore contains the identical and the different.

National sentiment obviously varies from people to people.
that protect and strengthen it, others that relax and dissolve it. Beneath these
different forms, traditions of unequal strength and effectiveness are either maintained
neglected or abandoned.

The diversity of these elements is one of the causes of Europe's diversity.
nations, through the variety of their territorial frameworks, needs and ambitions, and the
needs and ambitions, and the satisfaction of those ambitions and needs.

Words are enough to say it: one is born of a party, one is born of a nation. It cannot be repeated too
often
that the difference between the two terms is that between Association and Society.

Those who associate create the common element established between them. The members of a society
begin by being members. They may join it later, rebel against it or leave it, but it pre-existed them.
it pre-existed them. If their personal will creates their conduct towards it, its very existence only
depends on theirs.
depends on theirs only to a small and remote extent.

To establish the distinctive character of any nation, we need only consider a single moment in its history.

single moment in its history. The qualities that we assert about a people must be constants
constant, so as to reveal themselves throughout its life.

Man and his nationality

The organs of broad unification, the creators of great nationalities, are not individuals
their immense herd of small, autonomous wills. These limit their scope
to the particular interest of each one of them, and to that of the family, which is the "extension
"extension" of oneself. This is all that can be asked of a freely consulted citizen. In
history, all the overkill comes from a very different breed of beings, from the small handful of
founders, directors and organizers.

They have perfected a social life superior to individual life. Remove, suppress these frameworks
their foundations, try to reduce everything to the "individual", give everything to the Number, take
everything away.
everything to the Number, take everything away from Quality, and you'll see the birth of new
formations that will be worth
worth just as much as their personal average. Italy is worth more than the individuals

Italian people, just as France is worth more than our French people.
neither our France nor Italy has had universal suffrage and the French regime as its generating principle.

egalitarian regime. Both rest on generations of masters, heroes and artists, demigods and saints.
demi-gods and saints.

It's true that nationality is not a racial phenomenon. It does not follow that nationality is the
artificial result of an act of contracting will. Without doubt, and with a certain freedom, we adhere
adheres to our race, our nationality, our nation, but we adhere as we consent, in the same way that we
consent to the other.
the

the most tacit way, and adherence is solicited, it is carried along by a multitude of beneficent forces
against which we are not even on guard, and which we wholeheartedly endure.
9,999 times out of 10,000.

Between raw Nature, understood in the strict, direct sense, and artifice, legal or otherwise
the more or less arbitrary will of man, there is an intermediary that we could call a second nature:
Society.
second nature: Society. Social life is essentially part of man's nature
nature of man, who absolutely cannot exist without it. Nationality is a
modality of this natural state. We can recall a social fact. There is nothing so rigorously
than the need to live together. We cannot escape this need
nor from the society that satisfies it, whereas we can change nationality and even take advantage
and even take advantage of the diversity of nations to live more or less outside any nationality.

Nationality therefore derives from human nature, defined and qualified by society. Far from
the simple wish of our personal will, it corresponds to an enormous mass of desires
of desires, passions, needs, aspirations, customs, mores, ways of being, thinking and speaking
of being, thinking and speaking, which often goes so far as to shape our physical
conscience and deliberate will play a role that may be primary, but is not always, nor is it always
but not always, nor most often.

To convince ourselves of this, we need only consider two cases.
ubi bene, ïbi patria: if one's homeland is where one is well, then where one is well is also one's homeland.

is also the homeland 1 On the contrary, stripped of legal embellishments, the idea of nationality,
as we have just shown its natural, social and historical components, stands up perfectly
It can be further decorated and polished, but the main thing is still there...

The double test judges the value of the competing conceptions.

Nationalism

We have to start at the beginning, by asserting, teaching and distributing
a positive doctrine that will appeal to both minds and hearts. The discussion
will follow. Start with the idea of France. Make sure that your future opponents
to give the same importance to French independence as you do. To this end,
develop the philosophy of French nationalism. Strongly motivate the sentiments you would like
would like to engender among educated minds. The best way to prove the value of the idea
The best way to prove the value of the idea of homeland is to show concretely what ours is worth, what we owe to it,
how it envelops us, sustains us and predestines us in every way. Our history,
well analyzed, can equal the most moving of poems.

Patriotism and nationalism: definitions

The two words, in their past, etymology and meaning, have very different meanings.
distinct meanings. Patriotism has always meant piety towards the national soil, the land
of ancestors and, by natural extension, the historic territory of a people: the virtue it denotes
applies above all to the defense of territory against foreigners. As the word implies
a determined frontier, a defined political state, it has something official and settled about it. The
intriguers and freebooters, as Mistral put it, are obliged to take their hats off to it. But,
however necessary patriotism may be, far from rendering the virtue of nationalism useless, it actually
brings it to life.

Nationalism applies, rather than to the Land of the Fathers, to the Fathers themselves, to their blood and works
their blood and their works, to their moral and spiritual heritage, even more than to their material one.

Nationalism is the safeguard due to all these treasures, which can be threatened without a foreign army having crossed the border.
foreign army has crossed the border, without the territory being physically invaded. It defends
the nation against the stranger from within. The same protection may still be due in the case of
continued foreign domination whose force is enshrined in written law, but has not
has not become a real right, as was the case, for example, in Poland, Ireland and,
Italy in the days of Mes Prisons.

When one people imposes a doctrine or a method on another, it does not follow at all
that it brings them closer to a more general culture, closer to the universal. It can happen.
It doesn't always.

The very essence of the French classical spirit is to be enriched by adaptation, by intussusception of all the great discoveries of humanity.
all the great discoveries of humanity. Thus Rome, according to Montesquieu, honored itself
to use all the devices of war, all the good methods it could observe in its enemies.
enemies. Germanism, on the other hand, confines itself to the narrow prison of a national spirit that
only human in its claims, for it is, in fact, strictly circumscribed in space and time.
in time.

So there's nationalism and nationalism? Are there as many nationalisms as there are nations?
But the same difficulty may arise for patriotism as soon as it is distinguished from simple
elementary piety of the native soil and its church steeple. Countries are no more equal than men, nor are nations.
nations. In all this, the mind must guard against the trap set by the vocabulary
of international democracy and that of jurists inattentive to the differences in the materials of
their deductions. The old saying has never ceased to be true, that a science is first and foremost a well-made language.
language. Necessary distinctions are not abolished by neglecting them. Legitimate abstraction
can be ignored, but that is not enough to annihilate them.

The government of France

Aristocracy

France was not made to live in a democracy. Neither France, nor any other country. Democracy is
is a "universal lie" - the word is not mine, it's Pius IX's. Democracy is a
political disease. You either get out or you die. You don't live in a democracy. And those who speak of
the "democracy" of English countries don't know it. English democracy is what we

call, in good Greek and good French, an aristocracy (three-headed republic, Crown,
Lords, Commons, conversations, parliament between these three heads). America is a
plutocracy. There is no living democracy except in countries torn and wounded to death.

But aristocracy is not the right remedy in France.

Whoever thinks of aristocratic or bourgeois rule is obliged to consider first of all that there is no
government of the Great, without rivalry.
government of the Great, without rivalry between the Great. Dissensions, divisions,
hatred of clans and classes (à la Gauloise) is the constant bane of bourgeoisies, as it is of aristocracies.
aristocracies.

Good people say to them: "Why don't you unite? Why don't you stop your personal quarrels?

And the greatest callers and criers of union are at the same time the greatest commoners
dividers.

And, without a single, non-elective power, exempt by its very nature from these divisions, any such regime
is condemned to the upheavals of the Greek, Italian and Flemish republics, to the
of France during the absences and minorities of the Hundred Years' War,
the weakening of royal power in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the interregnum of the 19th and 20th centuries.
of the 19th and 20th centuries.

This past, which we may find archaic, is nonetheless explanatory: it gives reason for what we see
it provides a luminous intelligence.

La Tour du Pin used to say that authority does not spring spontaneously from the masses. It is external
external to it, even though it is so ardently desired and nothing could be more useful. Neither the
the princes of Germany, nor the eupatrids of Athens, nor the Polish chivalry
from their Diet and Council what the Diet and Council did not contain. The more personal
assemblies, the better the quot capita tôt sensus functioned, and the more authority
authority belonged to the divisive elements. All you have to do is close your body's eyes
the eyes of the mind: these simple axioms of old political wisdom are irresistible.
irresistible.

We resist them, however, because we are more or less under the illusion of three or four great aristocracies
whose success fills the history of the world. There's Rome, there's Carthage, there's Venice,
and nowadays, the Imperial Republic of the English.

This illusion is so strong that the great Fustel de Coulanges himself was caught up in it. We don't realize

realize that, in these rare examples of aristocratic success, nature had made
of preparation. In Rome, Carthage, Venice and London, a perfectly homogeneous public good
homogeneity (here the land, elsewhere the sea) enabled good citizens to unite spontaneously in all difficult cases.
spontaneously in all difficult, life-threatening situations. Wherever this
homogeneity does not exist - which is to say, in most cases, the aristocratic republic is doomed
doomed to rapid failure. For this reason, it failed in Athens. It has failed, is failing and
will fail in France for this reason.

Our Gauls, contemporaries of Julius Caesar, lacked neither generosity nor devotion to the
their country's cause. Although they gave their lives, they rarely made concessions
of self-love.

To whom, or to what, would they have made such a concession? To the public good? But did they know it? Did it exist
for them? It's wrong to speak of a Gallic nation. Gaul was a geographical expression
and its territory occupied by races as diverse as the Celts and the Ligurians,
the Iberians and the Kymris. This territory was itself, as it is even more so today, extremely varied in terms of cultivation and exploitation.
variety of cultures and uses. The aristocracies that built great empires
founded great empires, had a very homogeneous economic situation.
Carthage and Venice were uniformly engaged in traffic, Rome in ploughing and grazing.
between those who represented the common economic interest. Here, the opposite is true:
Gallic federations were already suffering from the immense variety of French economic effort, as
as established by the variety of our geography.

Large-scale farming and small-scale farming, vine growing and beet or cereal growing, interests are already
interests are already at odds in the agricultural sector alone! But add to this the industries
commerce, which is also highly developed on our long stretch of coastline bathed by three seas
three seas, the radiating layout of our railroads, the diverse slopes of our rivers, which dictate the order of our canals...
dictates the order of the canals...

Any moral elite that emerges by election or selection from a country thus constructed,
may well have been recruited by a stroke of luck from among the most representative elements of the national fortune.
national fortune: the more faithfully they express France, the more they will be at war
each other, not out of narrowness of heart, but out of the tyrannical diversity of their respective
legitimate points of view.

With the best will in the world, they will work to neutralize each other, cancel each other out
each other, and finally to remove themselves from each other. This mutual subtraction, this mutual
their common and constant character. They cannot be
be added to one another, as they once were, except by the operation of a force of another essence
essence, albeit also founded on the ownership of command by a force
interests, but dominating them as the general interest dominates the particular interest
and in the same way that political prosperity represents and dominates economic
economic prosperity.

However it is composed, and however well it is recruited, there is no selection, no cooperation, no French aristocracy.
cooperation, no French aristocracy will feel and accurately represent France's national
to the point of being able to govern it. As a kingdom, France is a geographical

France is a geographical paradox, a European monster, under a republican regime.

The mere absence of an independent power, strong enough to bring together our varied interests
to converge our too-varied interests condemns us to furious struggles.
every moment of such a life is equivalent to a wound for the country, which divides it, exhausts it and
certainly brings it closer to its end.

134

The Empire, born of the Revolution

The Empire was a government of opinion, democratic, plebiscitary and elective. It is therefore
dependent. We can easily conclude that it is not independent.

What the Empire lacks is nationalism. Royalty is nationalistic, and that's a great fact.
The Empire is extra-national, that's another.

Without failing to do justice to the glories of the Empire, the purest have been directly at odds with the
deepest French interest.
French interest. No Bourbon, no member of the Capetian family
would have been physiologically able to conceive or consent to Napoleon III's foreign policy,
which was an international student's dream.

It is disputed whether it is right to assimilate Empire and Democracy. This assimilation is not mine
by the emperors and their party. The coins bore "
French Republic, Napoleon Emperor". The Empire sometimes, but not always, wanted to establish
heredity or dynasty: it did not. Its principle was revolutionary, elective and democratic,
democratic, invoking the popular will as expressed in the plebiscite and, in fact
and supported it were the "advanced" party and the liberal party which, in the
the party of war. It suffices to recall the dates of 1830, 1840 and 1848 to
to put this last point at the top of the debate.

Undoubtedly, this democracy was embodied in rm man, but the best of our political theorists
the best of our political theorists have taught, in line with the whole of ancient and modern history, that
democracy has several aspects.
several aspects: it can govern directly in its comices, or delegate rm council and an assembly
an assembly, or defer to rm man who may be called Cleon or Pericles,
Gracchus or Marius, certain Caesars or the Napoleons.

We call democratic rm power that derives in this way from the number of which it is the elected
representative, whether this power is exercised by rm or by the people.
power is exercised by one rm or by several.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, hereditary power can reside in a single family and its head, the King, or in several.
in its head, the King, or be distributed among several families making up the Patriciat, the Senate, as in the Republics of Venice and Rome.

It is quite arbitrary to split the Consulate from the Empire; it is no less fictitious to cut, as others might do, the Consulate or the Empire from the Revolution. All this, emanating from exactly the same principle, are one and the same, and must be judged as one. It makes up the
of twenty-five years of war and diplomatic operations, which, from the political point of view, in the names of Trafalgar, Leipzig and Waterloo.
Waterloo; if the treaties of 1815 were less disastrous than liberalism has maintained half a century, it was thanks to the diplomatic experience of the Restoration. At whatever military and moral heights our flags rose to between 1792 and 1815, we must realize that defeat realize that defeat is the final word.

Democracy can be Empire. Empire is a form of democracy.

The plebiscitary or parliamentary Republic is a government subject to opinion, and derives its principle from election.
its principle from election. The plebiscitary Empire is a government subject to opinion and which principle of election: even as it thought it was becoming hereditary, it sought, to the

it sought, at the first threat of undermining, its point of support in opinion in the election, both by the decrees of
decrees of 1860, the plebiscite of May 1870 and the Additional Act of the Hundred Days.

He wanted to be hereditary, but he didn't feel like it. Napoleon III's foreign and domestic policy Napoleon III was governed by the internal necessity of the plebiscite, in the sense of pleasing the majorities; material order, broad discounting of the future, diplomatic and military bluster, all these all held together.

The hereditary prince must first of all have been born such, and have accustomed himself to conceiving in himself the origin of his power.
of his power. He has to make it accepted. He must obtain assent. He does not have to beg suffrage of the will.

Dictatorship: dictator and king

Great crises cannot be resolved without dictatorship. The dictator is therefore necessary. But is he sufficient? The history of the great dictatorships shows what is good and bad in them, the service they

render
the service they render, the slope that drags them along.

Dictatorship needs counterbalances. Not in the realm of freedom - that would be contradictory.
But in the public interest. Dictatorship is short and collective, and therefore virtually anonymous,
dares to save everything, compromises everything, abuses everything. It quickly becomes
just as odious as the worst licentiousness of extreme anarchy. Dictatorships
dictatorships are more moderate, because they entail direct, constant responsibility
responsibility, because concern for the future cannot be alien to them.
The human mind is such that the empire of great duties and the experience of great powers
powers teach it to measure itself.

However, one man alone is not much. A man's life, a man's heart, a man's head,
it's all very exposed, very permeable to bullets, knives, disease and adventure.
The only rational and sensible form of authority for one is that which rests in a family,
from first-born to first-born, according to a law that excludes competition.
so natural that, since it involves dictatorship and is held virtually, the leader who
is no longer called dictator: he is king (let's understand the word: rex, director and driver
conductor, functionary of intelligence), and this royal magistracy, combining the two
ideas of command and heredity, is so flexible that it never ceases to be itself
itself as it varies over time, sometimes taking on the paternal aspect of a simple presidency of
presidency of his Councils or the States of his people, sometimes the apparatus of direct dictatorship,
sometimes indirect dictatorship by means of a senior minister. As happens in the case of
great things, the institution is far superior to men. Its main value
is to make full use of the past for the benefit of the present, while not sacrificing the future.
the future.

We hold firmly to these two terms, dictatorship and kingship, because dictatorship
being in the necessity and in the obviousness of things, if we exclude the King from this function,
yet inherent to his historic magistracy, it will be filled by people who would make themselves
titles to public favor. Nothing can be founded in our country outside royalty. But
you can appear to be founding something, and thus doom the country to new upheavals.

The royal dictatorship also offers the advantage of renewing the titles of the national monarchy.
As much as the fragile papers of the Constitutions and Charters should be judged by their floating and
variable value
the fragile papers of the Constitutions and Charters, we must also consider what happened to them time
and again.

represent. With or without paper, dynasties endure because of the effective services
to their people.

Integral nationalism: monarchy

Integral nationalism

Patriots may believe themselves to be republicans. Yet he prefers to see French strength unite and multiply
and multiply in the face of foreign rivalries than to divide and exhaust itself in
internal conflicts. When he doesn't confess the mute sentiments of his generous revolt at the
of the chronic and systematic tearing apart of the City, every act of internecine warfare
awakens in him a violent horror: what he avoids reproving in general, he blames and repudiates in detail.

in detail. His republicanism is a system in which he may believe, but which he cannot see practiced without suffering.
practice without suffering. He assigns various causes to the hated effect: sometimes it's evil men
men (whose equal worth republican law teaches him to revere), sometimes enraged parties
enraged parties (for whom the same Law validates conflicts and implies government). So much so that he
republican without consenting to the consequences of the Republic or to the conditions of its operation.
functioning. It's true that he's patriotic in the same way. He wants to uplift his country without
the means, just as he wants to keep the Republic without admitting its ordinary and natural effects.
natural effects.

A nationalist conscious of his role accepts as a rule of method that a good citizen
subordinates his feelings, interests and systems to the good of the Patrie. He knows that the Patrie
is the ultimate condition of his well-being and that of his fellow citizens. Any personal
that results in a loss for the Patrie seems to him a deceptive and false advantage. And
any political problem that is not resolved in relation to the general interests of the Patrie
seems to him an incompletely solved problem. Nationalism therefore imposes on the
which are agitated before it a common denominator, which is none other than the interest of the nation.

interest. As for the Roman of whom Bossuet spoke, the love of the Patrie passes for him all
all things.

I saw on the Acropolis, littering the terrace where the eastern facade of the Parthenon rises, the debris of the small temple
of the small temple that the Romans, masters of the world, had erected there to the goddess Rome,
and I confess that the first idea of this edifice struck me as a kind of profanation. But
I found that sacrilege had its sublime audacity. To the most perfect beauty
beauty, to the most sacred right, Rome knew how to prefer the salvation of Rome, the glory of Roman arms.
and, not content with absolving her of this, the human race never ceases to show its gratitude.
gratitude. Contemporary England has provided examples of the same implacable
ancient virtue. French nationalism tends to foster among us an equal religion of the
goddess France.

In France, hereditary monarchy is the natural, rational and only possible
possible constitution of central power. Without a king, everything the nationalists want to preserve
will first weaken and then necessarily perish. Without a king, everything they want to reform
will endure and worsen or, as soon as destroyed, reappear in equivalent forms. As a condition for
monarchy is also its normal and indispensable complement.

Essentially, royalism corresponds to all the various postulates of nationalism.
which is why it calls itself INTEGRAL NATIONALISM.

137

Monarchy

At the beginning of national kingship, beyond the phenomenon of protection and patronage
a fact as complete, as primordial, as worthy of veneration and admiration as the
veneration and admiration, the fact of strength which is also a fact of love, the fact of nature
which is also an act of will: paternity.

The Kings of France have been the Fathers of the Fatherland.

The admirable royal work, if methodically rebuilt, will be able to withstand pressures and shocks
and shocks far greater than the poor little constitutional mechanisms offered,
modest reformers. Will it stand the test of time?
Will it stand the test of time? These are transcendent questions. It's no good asking them of men.
men.

Humanly, nationally, we are sure of only one thing: the Monarchy would
would reconstitute France, but without the Monarchy, France will perish.

Qn demonstrates the necessity of the Monarchy like a theorem. The desire to preserve our
French homeland as a postulate, everything follows, everything is deduced from an ineluctable
movement. There's no room for fantasy or choice: if you've resolved to be a patriot
patriot, you're bound to be a royalist. But if you are thus led to the Monarchy,
you are not free to turn to liberalism, democratism or their substitutes.
Reason dictates it. You have to follow it and go where it leads.

The lesser evil, the possibility of good

Not being charlatans of Monarchy, as there are charlatans of Democracy, we have never taught that the
lesser evil is the greater good.
we have never taught that Monarchy, by its very presence, can avert the evils of which civil war or
foreign war

which civil war or foreign war, physical epidemics or moral plagues can threaten
threaten nations.

What we are saying is that, in countries like France, hereditary Monarchy
combines not the best, but the only conditions for defense against these scourges. The
Monarchy is not incapable of error, but it is better able than any other power to unravel
and, in the event of misfortune, to return to the truth by making the necessary reparations.
repairs. Whether a sudden economic, social, intellectual or religious change
is required, the Monarchy can preside over it, either happily or with a minimum of damage. If,
caught up in a cyclone of the kind that history has sometimes seen, a brutal revolution
the passage is less harsh, the overthrow less complete, when it occurs under a leader
a leader, under a prince whose succession, having been settled in advance, will exclude any conflict
between
competitors. Thus, in Monarchy, the highest, most extensive, most serious interests are
placed in an atmosphere high enough and serene enough for us to hope that the hurricane
the hurricane does not rise. If, despite everything, it does, well! Too bad. The human race, at
mankind, at the height of its distress, will always have had the maximum of its guarantees. In this
misfortune,
the plague would be more frequent, more complete and more painful if the supreme power
were lower down.

Even fallen, demoralized, distraught, Monarchy carries with it the feeling and leaves
it leaves behind the notion of responsibility, memory and foresight, all things
democratic parliaments lack.

Royal monarchy confers on politics the advantages of human personality:
conscience, memory, reason, will; the republican regime dissolves its designs and actions
into a nameless collectivity, without honor or humanity. From then on, as Monarchy
naturally represents the capacity for the greatest good and the least evil, the Republic
signifies the permanent possibility of the worst matched by the least good. As for the elements of evil
and good
of evil and good, these are data that depend on circumstances and men.
and their intellectual and moral circumstances. Clearly, republican
wastes and perverts the admirable resources of mind and heart provided by France.
provided by France. Monarchy created the initial conditions. Clearly,
it would create the conditions for their rebirth.

Yes, the Republic is evil; yes, evil is inevitable in the Republic. And what we say about
Monarchy is the possibility of good. The public good, impossible in the Republic
is practicable in Monarchy; even in a monarchy that misses its goal, public evil remains
much less harmful than in a republic, because it is subject to end, with the bad minister or the bad king,

and the republican evil is subject to end.
republican evil, being inherent to the republic, can only end with it.

In the French monarchy, authority is independent, one and undivided.

For most people in the 19th century, and even today, absolutism is synonymous with despotism, capricious power.
despotism, capricious and unlimited power.

This is absolutely incorrect: absolute power means independent power.
monarchy was absolute when it was not dependent on any other authority, be it imperial, parliamentary or popular.
parliamentary or popular: it was nonetheless limited, tempered by a host of hereditary
of hereditary or corporate social and political institutions, whose own powers prevented
prevented it from stepping outside its domain and function. Its rights were confined to a multitude of rights that supported and balanced it. Old France was "bristling with liberties".

Neither Old William, nor Victor Emmanuel, nor Louis XIV were mediocre princes.
yet the political historian or political philosopher is tempted to prefer this magnificent
Louis XIII, who allowed the great Cardinal his incomparable founding and restorative dictatorship.
restorative dictatorship.

Royalty is an institution in which every national force is employed to the full, with almost no wastage.
without wastage, in such a way as to give the maximum yield.

In a republican Prussia, there would have been a good chance that Bismark, Moltke and Roon would have made war on each other.
Prussia would therefore have been worth: what the party of one of these men, the victor, was worth, minus what the party of Roon was worth.
minus the sum of each of the defeated parties.

With royalty, Prussia was worth: Bismarck, plus Roon, plus Moltke, plus the multiplier effect
of the good harmony established both by the function and the high personal value of the king.

We are not thinking of restoring a parliamentary monarchy in France. It may be in its place in Belgium
place in Belgium, where it can fulfill a higher national function, and even in England
the Empire.

As far as we are concerned, the immense benefits of the Restoration have never blinded us to the excessive part played by the parliamentary system.
of the excesses of the elective system. We must return to

to a system that re-establishes the distinction between the Government, responsible for governing, and the Representation, responsible for representing.
Representation, charged with representing. In the present state of nations, kingdoms, empires and empires and republics all complain of financial waste.
confusion between Parliament and the Sovereign.

The French monarchy, "traditional, hereditary, anti-parliamentary and decentralized",
in other words, the representative and corporate monarchy, is the only one capable of putting an end to this abuse.

The Republic needs to impose itself on consciences, since it is based on wills. It needs
It needs the enthusiasm of its subjects, who are its electors and who, nominally,
constitutionally, hold its destiny in their hands.

Monarchy, on the other hand, exists by its own strength, sua mole stat. It does not need to consult
to consult a so-called sovereign elector at every moment. All it needs is to be tolerated,
tolerated, and it always has more and better, precisely because its principle does not oblige it to harass people, to make them suffer.
to harass people, to constantly ask them to find it beautiful. The Republic is
a religion. Monarchy is a family. This one only needs to be found acceptable.
This one demands that we follow its rites, its dogmas, its priests, its parties.

Heredity and authority

Minorities and regencies are the bane of monarchies. This is the flaw in this form of government
which is not perfect - no government is - but which is the least imperfect of all.
imperfect of all. Nevertheless, its defect can be mitigated by a good law of succession (the law of the House of France, for example).
law of the House of France, for example), by the political spirit of the reigning race, and also by the will, by the patriotism, of the people.
will, by the patriotism, by the reason of the citizens, who are asked, once or twice
every century, an effort wisely limited to a few years. The democrats who hope to avoid
this plague by proclaiming the Republic are like Gribouille, who drowns in the sea to avoid getting drown in the sea to avoid being drenched by the water from the sky: for proclaiming the Republic is precisely to establish permanently
the very evil they want to ward off. It means making a period of danger and crisis a permanent institution.
of danger and crisis, it is to make the Minority perpetual, it is to offer the Regency to universal competition!
competition!

With what sublime art and swift stroke Jacques Bainville has chiselled this elegant
assimilation!

For my part, I've always been careful to separate reflections on political and economic heredity
economic heredity from vague, adventurous and captious generalizations about strict physiological

physiological heredity. An aristocracy can be made up of a wide variety of blood types, and, this notwithstanding,
perform all its highest functions, if other conditions lend themselves favorably.
At the beginning of French history, there was a Frankish aristocracy, a Scandinavian aristocracy
Gallo-Roman aristocracy: all three contributed to the admirable feudal system.

Later, the phenomenon was repeated under the same conditions.

It was through professional heredity, which was not the heredity of rank or dignities, that this selection of families was formed.
families, thanks to which ancient France was able to produce, from age to age,
for centuries, such a remarkable staff of officers, judges, diplomats, artisans,
who excelled in all kinds of industries and trades.

Those who desire authority would do well to realize that authority is not made by human hands
that authority is born, that it is a gift from heaven.

Ephemeral people don't have to worry about which of them is best suited to govern.
to rule. It's up to the French races as a whole, or rather their history, to decide
which family is the head.

Two of these great families, after good service, were struck down.
Charles replaced the sons of Clovis, then the sons of Robert succeeded the sons of Charles.

There is no comparison between the Merovingian or Carolingian work and this great national work of generation and regeneration.
national work of generation and regeneration, in which the Robertinians
the Robertinians, now known as the Capetians. Thanks perhaps to their admirable law of succession,
these model princes built or rebuilt the country. When they fell, the state
declined with them. When they rose again, so did the state. This happened twice in the
Hundred Years' War (Charles V, Charles VII); it was repeated with the Wars of Religion and under
Henri IV... The Fronde and Louis XIV were the latest examples, before revolutionary anarchy
anarchy led us to Trafalgar, Leipzig, Waterloo and Sedan on a downward curve
motivated by their regicide or exit, and in which the momentary return of three of them
of three of them determined the point of national recovery.

The family which, amidst its ruins, arrogated to itself the title of IVth dynasty, made exactly the same collapse
as the revolutionary anarchy from which it sprang.

History's choice is clear.

The king

Corruptible as a man, the King has an immediate and perceptible advantage in not being corrupted.
not to be corrupted: his rule of sensitivity is to be insensitive to everything that affects only the
interests is to be naturally detached from those interests that solicit all others
below him: this interest is to make himself independent of them.

The King can ignore it, he can forget it. Let's put things at their worst. A mediocre mind, a weak
character
character expose him to error and misunderstanding. But it doesn't matter! His value, a man's value
of a man, is incomparably greater than that of the mechanical resultant of Forces, than the
the expression of a difference between two totals.

Whatever a man's character or spirit may be worth, it's still a character, a spirit, it's a conscience, a heart,
a flesh of a man.
a conscience, a heart, a man's flesh, and his decision will represent humanity, instead of the
the vote 5 against 2 or 4 against 3 represents the conflict of 5 or 4 forces against 2 or 3 other
forces. The forces themselves may be thinking, but the vote that expresses them is not thinking.
by itself, it is not a decision, a judgment, a coherent and motivated act as developed and
the personal power of a conscious, nominative, responsible authority.

This power judges in quality. It assesses evidence rather than counting witnesses.

Right or wrong, this is how it proceeds, and this process is superior in itself to the process of addition
and subtraction.
and subtraction.

Interested in knowing the truth in order to do justice, he encourages some, reassures others,
and sometimes listens to only one, if only one seems worth listening to. If need be, he defends them
against the pitfalls and temptations of the powerful. This human discernment of intellectual
and moral values differs, like night and day, from the blind and crude procedure of
democracies. The idea of handing everything over to a kind of singular combat or general battle
of the interests involved is a regression that repeats, in a new and far less beautiful form
duels that Saint Louis' predecessors were already indignant about.

Only barbarism can trust in the solutions of majorities and numbers. Civilization
brings into play as often as possible the discernment of truth, the cult of law. But
But this presupposes that the One, as judge and leader, distinguishes itself from the forces it is called
upon to arbitrate.
arbitrated by him. The sovereign is not the subject, the subject is not the sovereign. By mixing them up

democracy blurs everything, complicates everything, delays everything, and its degression takes the world back to the lowest levels of the ancient past.
to the lowest levels of the ancient past.

If we compare the vices of an assembly with the vices of a hereditary prince,
the virtues of an assembly to the virtues of a King, there are serious differences. The royal institution
royal institution mitigates or combats the effects of evil, while the republican institution supports and amplifies them. In the same way, Monarchy gives the virtue of royal persons an active and permanent support,
instead of Democracy, which wearies, despairs, exhausts or corrupts its best servants.
its best servants.

The worst sanction for royal "responsibility" is regicide, deposition or the fall of the dynasty.
dynasty: even this can be applied in the most iniquitous way, as, for example, to Henri IV or Louis XVI.

Henri IV or Louis XVI. But the idea of this sanction is strong enough to raise above itself the average king.
above itself. The preservation of their lives, their glory and their inheritance
merges, in the natural psychology of kings, with the preservation of the State.

They are interested in the survival of the state, and in fact, ours has seriously succumbed only once.
from 987 to 1792. But in the one hundred and forty-four years that the elective system has been officially established among us, there have been nothing but falls, revolutions, disasters and landslides.
responsibilities are divided both in scope and duration: divided in scope, since they are
extent, since it is divided between elected leaders, their parliament and the opinion of an entire
divided in duration, since, as a political responsibility, it is limited to individuals, without
without any repercussions for their descendants.

A dethroned king becomes a miserable exile.

A republican who has lost power is a great character who never loses hope of returning to it, and who lives surrounded by his descendants.
of returning to it, and who lives surrounded by a court of active and restless parasites.

This is why, if a king is both bitter and cautious of the public good, because he would lose
he would lose much if he lacked either of these qualities, the republican loses little either by risking everything or by doing everything.
to risk everything, nor to neglect everything: he can even tell himself when he falls that he'll always be able to make up for it
the next time!

At that price, you can afford anything. Erostratus burned down the temple at Ephesus, but he roasted inside. Under a republican regime, you can set fire to all four corners of your administration,
get away with it and start again.

It doesn't matter that kings and princes are good and capable people!

142

But good reigns, great reigns, brilliant restorations are always linked to the spirit
of the institution that makes these high human values infinitely more frequent and infinitely more
infinitely more productive than in the Republic, for the reason that one prince, two princes, ten princes
are easier to educate than ten princes.
ten princes are easier to educate than ten million voters, or even nine or ten hundred
mostly improvised politicians we call parliamentarians.

But, finally, the essence of the royal mechanism does not rest on the value of individuals, and the value
of the reign does not result from the value of the state.
the value of the reign does not result from this single element.

In the Republic, it's all about that! In the Republic, you need virtue, heroic virtue, stoic virtue.
stoic virtue. Or there's nothing left. And the minimum amount of virtue required includes a steadfast
Roman faith
in the promises made to the electorate!

As soon as everything depends on the electorate's vote for a program, the regime collapses and falls apart.

collapses and is dishonored, if there is no fidelity of the elected to the program of his elector, at least
in the average case". In a republican country such as ours, this is what happens.
what would have happened in the Middle Ages, for example, if the oaths of loyalty and homage
the moral foundations of feudal hierarchy, had not been guaranteed by a certain
a certain moral and religious tone, a certain sense of honor that made the system viable.
made the system viable. The system was weakened when these virtues gave way
different states of mind and heart.

At least feudal loyalty lived on, and lasted for several centuries! But republican
republican virtue? Even if limited to loyalty to electoral commitments, it has been denied,
right from its cradle in 1792, when the assemblies centralized to carry out a decentralizing
decentralizing program, when they waged war in order to implement a peaceful
when they destroyed the monarchy they were mandated to uphold. These
power alone and the condition of that personal power, instead of executing the
executing the mandate of their principals. These assemblies of usurpers were thus the opposite of
"virtue".
the opposite of "virtue".

This republican virtue existed only in the dreams of a certain number of doctrinaire
ideologues. Reality has always cancelled them out so well that the Republicans of the 111th Republic,
barely

electoral victors over reaction, were in no greater hurry than to declare the heroic times and declare the old beards disqualified.

Through their disqualification, the institution achieved the disqualification of the Patrie.

They then began to govern among themselves for their own use and benefit, which the fictions comfortably helped, served and protected,
comfortably protected by the fictions and realities of the regime. But this precipitated the ruin of everything else.

Either we abjure these lying fables, demolish these dangerous realities
political truth and re-establish the national monarchy, or we have a sure and sad chance that before long we'll be the last of the French.